

25  
CENTS

# THE Catholic Mind

52ND YEAR  
OF PUBLICATION

## ARTICLES AND ADDRESSES

|                                |                   |     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| The Catholic Press             | Cardinal Stritch  | 513 |
| The Press and Public Opinion   | Cardinal Feltin   | 524 |
| "Asia for the Asians"          | R. S. Manglapus   | 533 |
| Religion Now?                  | <i>The Priest</i> | 539 |
| Decree on the Eucharistic Fast | <i>Mediator</i>   | 544 |

## DOCUMENTATION

|   |               |     |
|---|---------------|-----|
| Canonization of Pius X                              | Pius XII      | 551 |
| To the International Union<br>of the Catholic Press | Msgr. Montini | 557 |

## Louisiana "Right-to-Work" Bill

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| I. Statement of the New Orleans Archdiocesan Unit of the Catholic Committee of the South   | 561 |
| II. Telegram from Archbishop Rummel to the Industrial Relations Committee                  | 563 |
| III. Remarks of the Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S. J., before the Industrial Relations Committee | 564 |
| IV. Telegram from Archbishop Rummel to the Capital and Labor Committee                     | 570 |
| V. Remarks of the Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S. J., before the Capital and Labor Committee      | 570 |
| VI. Message sent by Msgr. Plauche to all members of the Louisiana House of Representatives | 575 |

SEPTEMBER, 1954

VOL. LII, NO. 1101

A PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICA PRESS

# TODAY'S PROBLEMS ARE YOURS

The problems confronting the world today belong to you—yours to cope with—yours to solve — but first **YOURS TO UNDERSTAND.**

Here are two booklets primarily designed for your information.

Explanations of crucial questions with a Catholic exposition.

## THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Discourse of Pope Pius XII with commentaries by Edward A. Conway, S.J. and Gustave Weigel, S.J. Pope Pius XII discourses on the shrinking of the world into a neighborhood. The Pope, himself a jurist, made his most important pronouncement in this document on the moral exigency of realizing in concrete form a community of peoples. Father Conway comments on the partially realized community of peoples in the form of the United Nations. Father Weigel spells out religious toleration in the community of nations.

## DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE VATICAN

By Robert C. Hartnett, S.J. *Editor-in-Chief* of AMERICA and Robert C. Graham, S.J. Associate Editor

- Father Hartnett clearly and concisely explains the facts behind this vitally important question.
- Father Graham describes the role of the Vatican in world diplomacy.
- The booklet includes Dr. Edward S. Corwin's forthright statement on the alleged constitutional issue of "Separation of Church and State."
- A valuable and useful bibliography rounds out the contents of this penetrating study of U.S. papal relations.

Single copies 25¢ Payment must accompany all orders under \$1.00.  
Quantity Prices—one title or assorted—10 to 49 copies, 10% discount; 50 to 99 copies, 20% discount; 100 or more, 30% discount.

THE **America** PRESS

70 E. 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.



# THE Catholic Mind

---

VOL. LII

SEPTEMBER, 1954

NO. 1101

---

## The Catholic Press

SAMUEL CARDINAL STRITCH  
*Archbishop of Chicago*

*An address at the Catholic Press Association convention banquet,  
Chicago, Ill., May 13, 1954*

AS YOU gather here for your convention, there is going to be in your minds, I am sure, a thought of the importance and high responsibility of the Catholic Press. Its importance is emphasized in our day by the very fact that, in countries where atheistic Communism has seized control, one of its first efforts has been to strangle the Catholic Press and then to suppress it. In the letter of the Polish Hierarchy to the regime in Warsaw of May 8, 1953, there is told in sad, restrained language the story of the suppression of the Catholic Press in Poland. First there came the censors. They were not really censors, because from the beginning they had in mind the suppression of the Catholic Press.

They made it so impossible for Catholic newspapers and periodicals to address the Catholic people that, step by step, they accomplished their purpose of suppression. Articles were changed and in the change the whole sense was distorted, even to the point of making the article unprintable because it violated Catholic truth and fact. The result of this suppression was that, in a country where the Catholic Press had a wide influence and did a great good, the people were denied Catholic newspapers, periodicals, books and even printed prayers.

It has been the same story in all the countries where atheistic Communism has seized control. One of its first efforts has been to suppress the

Catholic Press. Now a government or a regime does not suppress a thing that it does not fear. This act of suppression on the part of the enemies of man and the persecutors of the Church indicates very clearly how highly they regarded the importance of the Catholic Press. Pope after Pope in our times has stressed this importance, and there is not a bishop of the Church who has not, time and time again, stressed it in his diocese. Of old, people gathered in the squares of their cities to listen to teachers, to commentators on the news and to heralds who brought the news from afar. Some of us who have seen, years ago, some cities of the Orient have witnessed with our own eyes these teachers standing in the public square, with crowds gathered about them, hanging on their words.

### THE PRINTED WORD

The public square of today is the daily newspaper, the periodical and popular literature. We should add also radio and television, but, however great the importance of radio and television may be in our times, it still remains a fact that the printed word is more important. Our Blessed Saviour, when along the highways and in the public places He preached the Gospel, was only taking advantage of an opportunity of His times. Certainly, in this great modern world, it is necessary for us to preach the Gospel, to tell the truth of religion,

to tell authentic Catholic news through the medium of our Catholic Press.

Some weeks ago I addressed our Catholic educators gathered here in Chicago in convention, and in that address stressed the importance of Catholic educators in teaching the Gospel of Christ. They do other things in their school-rooms, but all these things that they do are integrated in their teaching of religion. I say to you something that you know full well, that it is not enough for us to teach our children. There is a great need of Catholic adult education. We have set up study clubs, forums and such things, but a principal medium, apart from the teaching in the churches, for Catholic adult education is our Catholic Press. It is no wonder, therefore, that you are always trying to make the Catholic Press better and more effective in its work.

In this convention you are going to face a great many problems which confront you and, after discussing these problems, you are going to know better how to solve them. For our duty today is to make the Catholic Press more widespread and more effective in its work. There have come new techniques in journalism and popular writing, and some of these techniques are good and we must use them in the Catholic Press to the fullest extent possible. Your work is to present the authoritative teaching of



the Church, to tell the authentic story of the life of the Church in our times and to comment in the light of your Faith on the many problems of our times which have a deep moral and religious bearing. You will not become great because of your mere economic news and comments, nor because of your sports pages nor because of your comics. Your greatness must come from your fidelity in printing Catholic truth and Catholic news and presenting it to your readers. Now I am going to take this opportunity to point out to you some opportunities within your grasp, but before doing that I am going to discuss briefly a matter which is of concern to you and to all patriotic citizens of the United States.

One of the blessings which God has given us here in our country is freedom of the press. We are free to publish our Catholic newspapers and periodicals and books. We are free to discuss problems of the day which have a religious or moral bearing, and to discuss them in the light of the truths of our Faith. This is an enjoyment of the freedom of the press which prevails in our country. We look upon it as so basic a right that we jealously guard it. It is one of the basic tenets in our political philosophy. The question comes: does

not this freedom of the press impose a responsibility? All through our history our answer to this question has been in the affirmative. We have always, in public opinion, held the press responsible for its very freedom. While in some respects it has been necessary to define this freedom as different from license in civil law, on the whole we have looked to the press itself to satisfy its responsibility. Now freedom itself is the freedom to do what is right. The moral law does impose a limitation on freedom, and that limitation is that we are not free under the moral law to do what is wrong. When, therefore, the press fails to satisfy its responsibility and keep within the limitations which the moral law imposes on its freedom, it inflicts an injury on public welfare as well as the good of individuals.

There will be a variety of opinions on public questions, and this variety must be reflected in our press. There will be honest differences, and these differences will appear in our press. But there is a limit beyond which, in the name of freedom, the press cannot go. Is it the right of a free press to tell the story of ugly happenings in lurid language? Is it the right of a free press to advertise the obscene? Is it the right of a free press to ex-



ceed the norms of propriety in picturing and telling of sex? Yet these things do happen, and the happening of them is becoming more and more frequent. It is commonplace to pick up a newspaper today and to read the expression of honest indignation at the behavior of some public servants and other men who should be an example in a community, and then to turn the pages and find in that same issue pictures and advertisements which certainly do not reflect a sense of responsibility on the part of the press.

### SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

News-gathering agencies have a great social responsibility and that is to gather the real news. Is it true that the news which appears in much of our press is real, uncolored news? News-gathering agencies should collect all the news which goes to make up a picture of a situation. Is it true that our news-gathering agencies are collecting and publishing much important news that is vital to giving a right picture of many situations in the world today? We have read news accounts on current conditions in Yugoslavia, and we have failed to see in these accounts a right presentation of the persecution of religion in that country. It is possible for any editor to color news when he wants to, and yet it is wrong for him to color news. This makes his news items editorial writings, and always we have made a

distinction between news items and editorial writings.

Keeping before our minds the great influence of the press in our country and anxious always to protect its freedom, we must ask of it a keener sense of the responsibility which its freedom imposes on it. There was a time in our country when at least very much of the press enjoyed a high esteem. We are only stating a fact when we say that today the press in our country has lost that high esteem, because it has failed in the responsibility which its very freedom imposes. We have no sympathy with those systems of political government which impose a censorship on the press. This is, to say the least, very near to tyranny and deprives the people of knowledge and information to which they have a right. But the way to protect the press in its freedom is for the press rightly to sense the responsibility which its freedom does impose.

It may be said that the press of any period reflects the life of that period, that the press today, with all its shortcomings, reflects the life of our times. The answer to this is that the press in our world helps *to make* the life of the day, and when the press has a keen sense of its responsibility, it is able to mold aright the life of a period. Many of the things which we regret in our day are attributable to the press which helped to bring them about. If we have a right sense of our



social duty and our responsibility to citizens and to people, we shall have a press which will be able to do more than merely reflect the bad things of the times. We shall have a press that will be strong enough to make right the bad things of the times and give us a better day.

The Catholic Press appreciates the freedom which it enjoys and is foremost in the defense of the freedom of the press. In its field it is free. Now, of course, there will be those who will say that the Catholic Press is not free, because the Catholic Press must necessarily give the Catholic viewpoint and the Catholic attitude. This is not an infringement on freedom. Freedom, after all, does not warrant escape from the truth. The Catholic Press accepts the teachings of the Church as true. It thinks in the light of these teachings; it acts in the light of these teachings. Truth never shackles; truth liberates. Within the truth, the Catholic Press is free. Anyone who is familiar with the Catholic Press in our country knows what divergencies of opinion are expressed in it. I have known a Catholic editor vigorously to oppose the omission of a column in which the writer said many things which wise heads thought a mistake. This editor's position was that this writer was acting in the freedom of the press as interpreted by the Catholic Press itself.

We don't want to make every statement in a Catholic newspaper, even

in the so-called official diocesan newspaper, an authoritative statement. Always we leave a lot of liberty to the press in expressing its opinions and convictions, and always we are ready to present both sides of a debatable question. There is no question but that the Catholic Press would be more effective if it engaged a little more in controversy on debatable subjects. Its columns would attract more interest if it were a bit more daring in the discussion of problems of our times which are debatable. We don't want the sort of uniformity in the Catholic Press which would come if every organ of the Catholic Press presented the same news and comments. As long as the Catholic Press acts in the light of the teachings of the Church and faithfully presents that teaching, we certainly do not even desire an unfortunate uniformity.

#### CERTAIN IMPERATIVES

There are certain imperatives for the Catholic Press which must always be kept in mind. These imperatives are not inconsistent with right freedom, but enhance right freedom and make it a precious thing. I am going now very briefly to point out these imperatives.

In giving the news, the Catholic Press must limit itself to those items which are important in the life of the Church and also in the life of our world. The Catholic Press will give the authentic news on Church hap-



penings all over the world. This is one of its main obligations, and in our times, because of what I have said before, it is urgently necessary for the Catholic Press to give full, detailed accounts of these happenings. Today, without the news of these happenings which is given in the Catholic Press, the public would not be well informed and would not have sufficient information on which to base a right judgment. Everybody knows the valuable service which has been rendered to the Catholic Press by the NCWC News Service. This is a valuable service and has helped mightily in our times to correct errors and to give authentic news. We have seen, in our daily experience, the Church harmed in some sections of the press by silence. It is not so much in giving news accounts of what is said, as what is not said that has done the harm. Bits of news that come over the wires are published without any effort to put this news against its proper background. Where the Church has been fighting atheistic Communism vigorously and with effect, some small, unfortunate happenings have been exaggerated into important news. In these circumstances the Catholic Press in its news items is a necessary corrective.

But a Catholic publication should not limit itself to the information which comes from the best of news agencies. With sources of information available, it has a wonderful op-

portunity to present a lot of important news which does not come from these news agencies. Every organ of the press should find a way to tap these other sources of news and to get interesting and helpful news for its readers. In these times we in the United States have learned a great deal of geography. Places which were just recently practically unknown to us appear day after day in our news columns. Only yesterday Indo-China was one of those unknown lands of the Orient about which we read something years ago in our childhood in our geographical readers. Today it has become an important place in the world and the bearings of the happenings in Indo-China today are directly related to the welfare of the whole world.

What a wonderful story it is—the story of the Church in Vietnam! When we go back over only a few years since the first missionary in modern times went into that area and see the increase of the Church, see the devotion of the Catholics, we realize that there is something in Indo-China about which our people know very little. We read about the United Nations assistance to backward areas in the world, and, of course, we applaud this assistance. Do we present to our people the story of the mission schools and what the mission schools have done? We are quite willing to pick up news items from Italy, but have we made any



research to present to our people the great work of Italian Catholics in Catholic Action in Italy in our times? Do we tell them about the strenuous efforts of the Church to improve social conditions, to take care of youths and to combat the awful thing of Communism?

### JOURNALIST IS TEACHER

Sometimes we take it for granted that our readers have as much background information as have our editors. This is not true. In fact, in the best modern schools of journalism, the emphasis has been taken from mere journalistic technique and placed upon giving that background information which is necessary for a real journalist. Now the journalist is a teacher and the journalist must keep in mind the audience that he is teaching. He must not be content merely to give them information which he readily associates, in his mind, with his store of information on a particular subject. He must, in simple language, present the item in its proper setting, to give the readers the information that will be helpful to them. We may have learned Catholic journals and publications, we may have excellent Catholic popular books, but the most important function of the Catholic Press is to give this news in the right way, news which can rightly be called Catholic news.

I think that you have tried to do this and I think you have tried to do

it very well. I don't want to be a carping critic, but in all truth I would say to you I do think that you have an opportunity in this field to do an even better job than you have done in the past.

The Catholic Press is the principal organ for making known the encyclical letters and the statements of our Holy Father, as well as the official pronouncements of the Hierarchy. It is not possible from our pulpits to give in full detail the encyclical letters and the statements of our Holy Father, the Pope. He is our chief pastor, he is our chief teacher in the Church. All of us want to know everything that he says. All of us want to understand what he says and to make it a very part of ourselves. In printing these encyclical letters and these official statements of our Holy Father, the Catholic Press must exert itself to making them better known and understood. It should engage the services of expert scholars for helpful comments on them. Certainly of all the news which the Catholic Press can print, the encyclical letters and the statements of our Holy Father, the official acts of the Church, are the most important.

You have not neglected this duty. You have tried to fulfill it, but I think you will agree with me that more should be done in this field than has been done in the past. We have many expert scholars who specialize in different fields of Catholic learn-



ing. We could engage some of these scholars. They would be most willing to help the Catholic Press in its work of printing the teachings of our Holy Father and the official acts of the Church and presenting them to their readers in an understandable, intelligent way.

We now come to an activity of the Catholic Press the importance of which must not be underestimated. This activity is commentary on the news and the problems of our day. My experience is that our Catholic people crave these commentaries. They are frequently confused and they sense that much of the news and many of the problems of the day have deep moral and religious bearings, and they want to think aright. It is our duty to teach and we must be courageous in teaching. These commentaries cannot be just the sort of thing that one writes at the end of a busy day. They must be well thought out, they must be balanced, and they must be informative. How can you expect a layman to think intelligently with the Church on many of these problems unless he has help and guidance? Of course, this sort of commentary will occupy our Catholic periodicals and our Catholic learned publications, but it should also be an activity of the general Catholic Press.

Here is a question which requires a great deal of thought and study. I think that if more of the space of our Catholic newspapers were given

to this sort of activity, and less given to how to make a new dress or how to cook a new sort of food, the press would be more effective in its reaches. But you may say to me, just what do you mean? Do you mean that we should engage in partisan politics? By no means. That would be a mistake. I mean that the Catholic Press should face those problems of our day which have a deep moral and religious bearing and discuss them in the light of Catholic Faith.

For instance, there are the two great encyclical letters, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, both enriched by many precious statements of our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, which give us the right principles for the setting-up of a real Christian social order. Now there are problems in the setting-up of this right Christian social order, problems which vary because of economic conditions in different countries. The principles are immutable. The framework of the Christian order is fixed. When we add to these encyclicals the encyclicals on the Catholic Family, on Christian Education and on the Sacred Heart, we get the great outline of the Christian social order.

When we approach the task of fitting in the details, there come many problems. Now these problems, which appear in our own country, must be discussed outside learned journals and books written for the few. They must be discussed by a mind fixed



upon the whole framework and not fixed on only certain details of it. Despite all that has been written and all that has been said, there are many misconceptions regarding the right setting-up of a true Christian social order. Here the Catholic Press has an opportunity. It can present article after article, all conceived as a whole, and instruct our people in a right way on this important subject, which is a moral and religious subject. There are many other such questions and I have not the time now to indicate them, but they will come to your minds just as they come to my mind when I set myself to thinking about them.

#### DUTY TO EXPOSE FALSEHOOD

The Catholic Press has a duty which we look upon as imperative, and yet it is one of those very distasteful duties. There are some things that we have to do in life that are hard to do and we don't like to do, but we are compelled by duty to do them. We may just as well face the fact and be realistic and say, despite our growth, despite all the things that we have done, in some quarters there is increasing antagonism to the Church. Attacks are made in the way of a statement of untruths and sometimes of half-truths. If we analyze these statements, we find that they are very different from the old calumnies which originated in the large with the Centuriators of Magdeburg.

We were familiar with these old calumnies and with Maria Monks and such. They did us no real harm and in fact, in the long run, they were helpful to us. This new thing has come out of perhaps an inherited vague, undefined attitude of antagonism toward the Church which has found agreeable atmosphere in a liberalism that would make democracy a religion rather than a political system.

It is the duty of the Catholic Press to expose the falsehood and the want of full truth in these statements and attacks. We want to live in charity with our fellow citizens and to work unselfishly with them, in true patriotism, for the good of our democracy. We think enough of our democracy to die for it and to suffer for it. There is nothing in the teaching of the Catholic Church which is not congenial to sound democracy. It pains us when these statements are made and these attacks are launched. Sometimes we have judged that the best answer to them is dignified silence. Nevertheless, silence is not always a right policy. The Catholic Press must take these statements, evaluate them rightly and give right answers to them. At a time when all men who believe in God should be united in fighting godless systems and godless attacks on our free institutions, it is unfortunate that we have to use time to combat these false statements and attacks. Perhaps, however, if we

think deeply and inform ourselves well, we shall find that, wittingly or unwittingly, many of these attacks are in fact the attacks of the godless upon us.

### NEWSPAPER CRUSADES

Now I come to the question of newspaper crusades. You know that in many sections of our press, for circulation purposes, crusades have become very common. They are carried on spectacularly but not always to a complete finish. We have no need for circulation-promotion activities, except those which are right and are at our command. A newspaper crusade is a dangerous thing if it is not kept well in hand. In promoting its objective, it can easily yield to the temptation of not presenting all the facts and of letting emotion override reason. I would not say that a newspaper crusade against evil is not a good thing, but I do say that it should be kept in proper balance. It should be objective and it should present all the facts.

There are times when the Catholic newspaper must engage in a crusade, if we interpret that word in the accepted modern journalistic sense. It is our duty to safeguard morals and to do all in our power to remove from our communities the occasions of sin. We have a theatre problem, and it is not only a problem of the film theatres, but also a problem of theatres in general in our country.

Dare we stand by and be silent when the obscene is pictured alluringly on theatrical stages? Are we going to submit weakly to those who, in the name of freedom, claim the right to exhibit in public places what is obscene? Are we going to say that a story presented with scenes that are obscene, and dangerous to youth, must be permitted, because at the end of it there is some sort of applause given to virtue? We must take the position which our very duty imposes upon us and point out these dangers to morals. We do not, despite what some would have us do, accede to the statement that morals are so indefinite a thing that they cannot be legally defined. We are living in a changed world and it is not enough merely to call upon police power after the damage is done.

Our Catholic Press has taken a strong position on this question. It has engaged in what you may call a crusade, but it is a holy crusade, and a crusade for what is right and good and holy. Let me go further and say that this same position has to be taken with regard to many popular romances and books, some of which are written by Catholics. When art stoops to doing a dirty thing, it no longer has a right to our admiration and support. In our book reviews we must give to our people the information on books which they expect from us. A little survey will show how much they really expect in this field



from us. Let us put aside those people who in the name of freedom are so free that they really doubt in their own minds whether two and two are four. Let us be ready to endorse what is good, to ask for what is good, but let us never be so cowardly that we will not point out what is bad, what is dangerous, what is an occasion of sin. Yes, we must have crusades. They must be conceived in the spirit of the original crusades.

Of old, men gave themselves to protecting the institutions of Christendom. They took the cross, left their homes and went out into strange lands to fight for these institutions. Today there is a mighty enemy and we are contending with that enemy, but we must not make the mistake and fail to realize that these other things, these degrading things, these immoral things, are vicious attacks on the institutions of Christendom. In the spirit which the old crusades had, let us carry on our crusades against these things and against what is bad and what is immoral in public and private life. But in doing this, let us keep our thinking balanced, let us get all the facts before us and let us be rational rather than emotional.

This brings up another question which perhaps we should not even mention here at this convention, but which I shall mention in passing. The time has come when we must do more to provide healthy recreation with the

best modern techniques for our people. We need more gifted writers, we need more literature of the right sort, and we need dramatic talent of the highest sort. All this is going to come largely when we support the right Catholic literature and help the authors and publishers to carry on the work of spreading it. Here the Catholic Press can do an important and a mighty work.

Now I have pointed out to you some of the imperatives which you must face in your work in the apostolate of the Catholic Press. I have not done this with the thought of saying that you have not had these imperatives before your minds. Rather, my intention has been to try to say something to help you to do what you have been doing better than you have done it in the past. Remember that complacency in a newspaper or publishing office is stagnancy. The moment that we are satisfied with ourselves in the field of the Catholic Press is the moment when we begin to deteriorate. A holy dissatisfaction with what we are doing is a postulate for progress in our work. It is, therefore, because we want you to progress and we want this convention to be a milestone in your progress, that we have said the things to you which we have said tonight. I hope that your convention will be everything that in our prayers we want it to be. May the Holy Spirit guide you.

# The Press and Public Opinion

MAURICE CARDINAL FELTIN  
*Archbishop of Paris*

*Address at the Fourth International Congress of the Catholic Press,  
Paris, France, May 5, 1954. Reprinted from the ENSIGN.\**

**C**ATHOLIC journalism must be missionary and therefore competent.

Missionary means that Catholic journalism, while always remaining frankly and wholly Catholic in its inspiration and aspiration, must not envisage only the Catholic group as its field. It must also think of those outside the Church. They also read the Catholic press, furtively or regularly, and not only in order to attack it.

Is our press always that way?

One sometimes comes across an old paper in a drawer or an attic, for newspapers do age rapidly. One is struck by the feebleness of its yellowed pages. What a restricted spirit of the "church-steeple" mentality, what petty little accounts without importance or value! There is something missing to make one feel one is dealing with periodicals of our time. There is a tone and a style in the editorials and in the reporting which is really not yet baptized, which is not Christian. Cultivated Catholics sometimes blush when they see their press so badly presented.

Why is it that there is such maladjustment? Why a press so hard for honest people to read? The reason is simply that it lacks verve, it lacks universality. It is an instrument of cohesion and defence for a sect, within which each knows everyone and all comment on local news. The uninitiated reader does not feel at home amidst the news of an unassimilated and unassimilable clan, unless he makes superhuman efforts of goodwill.

I by no means want to suggest that all our Catholic journals have succumbed to this infantilism or group chauvinism. One is always unjust when one dwells only on one aspect of a whole. But who is there amongst ■■ who does not subscribe to ■ part of this criticism?

This criticism would remain sterile if it remained negative. But one can make some constructive suggestions.

The first suggestion is regarding the choice of events to be reported. There is ■■ advantage in being limited in space by the size of the paper. In this way one is forced not to say



everything. A newspaper — at least the one worthy of its vocation — should not be a mere recording machine or passive film, accepting every image inflicted upon it. We know of ever so many papers in ever so many countries which merely serve up to their readers so and so many pounds of printed newsprint and still call themselves newspapers.

The Catholic newspaperman makes a choice amongst the torrent of news rushing in upon him. But this choice is sometimes too arbitrary, either because the editor tries to please his clients so as to retain them, or else he obeys too much his partisan caprices and passions in order to denigrate his adversaries.

### MISSIONARY SPIRIT

It is here that the missionary spirit must intervene. Rather than tying himself to petty items of news, instead of seeking to limit himself to the narrow confessional outlook, the Christian journalist makes an effort to see all things as a whole. On the one hand he must replace individual happenings into their original context, otherwise they fail to make any sense and become monstrosities. On the other hand he must stack them into the pyramid of true values, which has God as its base and also its pinnacle.

Presentation of news is also important. Instead of drifting into too facile a form of apologetics and re-

stricted to the purely negative approach, the self-respecting journalist will endeavor to present news objectively, without tendentiousness and without twisting facts.

The presentation of facts, selected and distilled according to their importance, requires further great intellectual effort. The journalist is not merely a transcription robot. Particularly with Catholics, their effort must obviously be based on an approach directed by their Faith, ■ theological concept of the world, which is ■ gift of grace and which no publicist ever has the right to forget.

His mission—and this is what distinguishes him from the honest journalist who lacks faith—is that he can extract from the transitory and contingent happenings that which also gives the news meaning in the light of eternity, and places it in relation to the Absolute. I had occasion to say it once, on the feast of the journalists' patron saint, Francis de Sales, that the men of the press are dispensers of the Word. They must act ■ messengers of the Gospel, prophets of the whole Truth, which resides in Christ.

Do not believe that good-will and even interior sanctity suffice for this duty. In order to expurgate this spirit of clannishness, in order to rise above what is disparagingly called "the Catholic mileu"—that is to say, that spirit which is most opposed to Catholicism, namely, the spirit of a so-

ciety closed in upon itself in order to jealously preserve its privileges—in brief, to give to your press a missionary character a journalist must above all else be competent.

Nothing discredits many of our publications so much as that quality which is described as amateurism. One does not improvise oneself into a journalist. One does not enlighten public opinion by improvisation. Expediencies of technique too often turn against those who misuse them. The best propaganda, the only legitimate propaganda, flows from perfected technique.

The most eminent journalists, and the most famous ones, have often started by being good workers, good artisans who know their profession because they had the courage to learn it. I do not speak here merely of ty-

pographic and material knowledge, which no one should think of underestimating, but I understand by competence familiarity with the methods which are peculiar to the press and which are not the same as those pertaining to other disciplines.

The science of public opinion has established itself. Institutes have been founded to study and understand the laws governing the development of an influence on the masses, and the adaptation of forms of expression to the various sociological groups which make up a nation and a continent. Should the Catholic journalist ignore these laws, his entire efforts will be compromised. But what is even more serious is that his incompetence will throw discredit on the Catholic Press in general and thus, in its final effect, also upon the Church of Christ.



### *Spiritual Guide for Laymen*

Whatever approach to developing lay spirituality might be best, I suggest that it is a subject which must be dealt with freshly, independently in most respects of religious spirituality, so as to provide the layman with his own map for progressing in the spiritual life. Existing guides are of some help, of course—one thinks of Francis de Sales—but they are inadequate for the most part because they were designed for those in religious life, and the layman is in the world at all times. He starts from a point different from that of the religious, and he must advance spiritually along a different road. He therefore needs his own spiritual map. For he cannot hope to progress spiritually by pretending that he lives with one foot in the cloister and the other, unfortunately, in the world.—*Thomas P. Neil in the PRIEST, Huntington, Ind., January, 1954.*



# Vocation Problems

*An editorial reprinted from the MISSION BULLETIN\**

**L**AST month we carried an item under "Notes and Information" from Ottawa, Canada headed, "L'effort Missionnaire catholique." The comparative figures on mission vocations among the Catholics of seven countries scare up a whole covey of thoughts and questions. Before bringing them down for discussion and comment, let's see the figures on the countries quoted. Here they are:

children do have a tradition and a lyric spirit of adventure that has driven them like sail wind to all parts of the world. One can hardly say that men sailing out for a lonely mission post leave for fortune, fame or song.

We have to search deeper to find the compelling reasons that move men to self-exile across the wide seas, when they go solely as couriers of the Gospel. It is more than the devil-

|         | Catholic<br>Population | Missioners<br>(Prs. Bros. Srs.) | For no. of<br>Catholics | Ratio to Priests<br>at home |
|---------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ireland | 3,200,000              | 7,000                           | 1 to 457                | 1-1                         |
| Holland | 4,000,000              | 7,065                           | 1 to 566                | 1-3                         |
| Belgium | 8,400,000              | 8,000                           | 1 to 1,050              | 1-4                         |
| Canada  | 6,349,500              | 3,931                           | 1 to 1,616              | 1-11                        |
| France  | 35,000,000             | 15,000                          | 1 to 2,333              | 1-11                        |
| Italy   | 47,500,000             | 7,800                           | 1 to 6,084              | 1-18                        |
| U.S.A.  | 30,000,000             | 4,400                           | 1 to 6,818              | 1-22                        |

Ireland's generous figure is astounding. She sends as many priests to the foreign field as she keeps at home. In 1950, for example, she sent out 565 priests to missions in foreign lands. Ireland has had no colonies like many European governments who encouraged and helped finance their missionaries for national influence or other political reasons. But Erin's

may-care nature of the Irishman, who deals out his wealth or his energies with equal largesse, that explains why they are so prodigal with their sons and daughters for the foreign missions. If we dig deep enough for the font of this generosity, we uncover the mighty virtue that moves mountains—pure faith.

How it got there is another full

story, too long to tell. Anyone knowing either a modicum of Irish history or spiritual axioms understands that robust faith comes to life only with great labor and pain. It grows like the lone pine on a hill which survives the storms and gets stronger, more solid and clinging from the buffeting. Tendril roots change to sinewy anchors, trunk veins knit closer together for resistance, and the branches bulge with knotty muscled arms to fight for survival. Faith in Ireland came like that. It was nurtured by opposition, grew up in struggle. The many centuries of oppression or downright persecution forged and welded with fire a cohesive national faith that stood up and grew stronger with the attack.

The axiom has been demonstrated in Ireland that faith like a boatman's muscle rowing against the current grows stronger battling with great adversity. This truth, demonstrated so often and over again, lets us hope with confidence that the faith in China and other mission countries now sorely tried by Communist fire will develop faster than it ever did under the thousands of expelled missionaries. Inscrutable Providence often works best alone. It uses strange tools, like suffering, to hammer the fallacies and follies from our souls, then forges them anew with a glowing faith and true values.

The report tells us that France is way out ahead and leads the field with

15,000 sons and daughters on the mission fields. Great organizations for sending their youth out with the torch of faith were started in France. Vincent de Paul first planted his mission society in the soil of France. Ignatius and Xavier formed their Company at the University of Paris. In France the White Fathers and Missioners from Lyons were started for the African missions; Paris Foreign Missions for the Orient and the world, and dozens of other societies were founded solely to train the youth for mission fields. Large numbers like large armies need supplies, so the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was started in France to finance mission work.

A colonial world offers some persuasion for home-loving Frenchmen to leave their country. And many other motives also lend driving force. But the fundamental reason that sparks mission endeavor and makes it run in France or in any other country is the faith, or should we say, the temperature of the faith. An argument that allows no cavil is that mission undertaking measures the vigor of faith in a nation.

One cannot say that the average over-all faith merits much praise in that Gallic nation of character contrasts. Generalizations, often erroneous, say the French character knows no middle way. He is very good or very bad! He walks the high road or the low, wants nothing in between.



But people who go all out do reach great heights with vast numbers as missionaries and saints.

### ITALY FALLING BEHIND

Among the old countries, Italy is running behind. With 45.5 million baptized Catholics she has only 7,800 foreign missionaries, while Holland's 4 million Catholics have over 7,000 on the field abroad. We can give some credit to the strong Protestant element in Holland for this. Protestantism has made the Catholics more alert and aggressive. Competition enlivens business: it also stirs up religion, which languishes and slumbers without an occasional prod of some kind or other.

In Belgium, the other twin great in this mission business, Catholics are in predominant numbers. But competitive incentive is present with the many mission societies there. And there is a tradition built up carefully and fostered diligently which gathers recruits in great numbers for the foreign missions. Little countries have an advantage of concentration, where the citizens are more one family. A young lad sets out for some pagan country and everybody knows about it. He is a trail-blazer. Others moved by his example follow his footsteps until a habit or tradition is built up to keep the ranks filled. . . .

New World countries entered the mission field only in the present century. Two North American countries

have come up quickly in a short space of time to share the Gospel command. Even here, however, a critical look uncovers many things that bring little comfort.

An American may like to boast that the Church in his country, though still a fledgling unable to fly alone, though it still calls many hundred missionaries from Europe each year for its own needs, yet gives a goodly number to the foreign missions. It sounds fine until compared with Canada's record, which is twice as generous. Canadians give one priest to the missions for eleven kept at home.

But in evaluating Canada's mission effort one should note that most of the candidates are from the Province of Quebec. This one Province has over 3 million Catholics—as many as all the rest of the Provinces combined. Quebec is on a par with Ireland for the number of faithful. In fact there is much similarity between the Churches of the two countries. Some of the Quebec dioceses give figures of 200,000 Catholics and less than 3,000 non-Catholics. Outside the commercial centers of Montreal and Quebec the size of the non-Catholic population is only between two and three per cent.

### TWO LOVES ARE WEDDED

As in Ireland, two great devotions, civic and religious, are merged in the Quebec outlook. There is a marriage

between spiritual and material interests which complement each other like body and soul. A backslider from the Faith is automatically considered disloyal to the country; "pas un bon Canadien." Apart from the theology of this outlook, fight and zeal for their land or their language have become somehow joined and identified with their religious fervor. The wedding is beneficial and the fruit of it is a more vigorous faith. If Ireland is united and the French Canadians lose their language, the character of these people may lose much of its flavor and their faith much of its fervor.

The blood, the language and the faith of Quebec's people are of French origin. Their language, particularly in the country districts, is today the old French, little different from the tongue of their ancestors who came over two and three centuries ago. The old faith and piety seem to have been singularly preserved in the new land, far away from the disrupting influences of the French Revolution of the seventeen nineties, and the anti-clericalism and secularism that followed.

The exotic plant of faith brought from old France took root and flowered in the rugged pioneer atmosphere of Quebec. Its bloom and growth were more vigorous and luxuriant in the new soil than in the old land of France. Today, Quebec's 3 million Catholics far outstrip the country of their forbears in vocations

for the missions. The record makes Canadian hearts beat with healthy pride and others throb with holy envy.

### AMERICA'S PART

America started sending her first contingents to the foreign missions about thirty years ago. Although a late starter in the field, the movement has attained a momentum of note, with 4,400 foreign missionaries. This gives little cause for rejoicing when compared with the country's sprint to world leadership in production, business and other fields. It may be explained if not excused where Catholics are a diminutive 20 per-cent minority of 30 million, scattered over an area as large as the whole European continent. Christianity thinly spread can never be as active, as militant or as productive of vocations as in the areas of dense Catholicity. Places like Boston and Providence, where the population is predominantly Catholic, have long had surplus vocations to give to the needy regions, while the West and South go begging.

Scattered members present a demanding drain on personnel. Fifty families in a small country district call for a priest's care the same as 500 families in New York, Detroit or Chicago.

The gigantic network of Catholic educational institutions, largest in the world and still expanding, makes a temporary but slashing cut in mis-



sion vocations. Ultimately the missions will gain if we do not make God wait too long. Right now the clamant call of American Catholic schools for teachers is detouring many away from mission life.

One day this writer commented to ■ Jesuit Provincial in America: "The Jesuits with their 7,000 members in the U.S. are not carrying out the traditional Society quota of men to the missions." The Provincial concurred but excused the default saying: "We have one mission field for the Province, but if you heard the outcry from schools and colleges for personnel, you would understand our difficulty in staffing the one mission."

### APPLYING REMEDIES

What's the answer? What is needed to bring mission effort and mission vocations up to a healthy quota everywhere? Where there is a malady one looks for ■ remedy. But if there is a general debility of the faith in a people, it is too big a job for human practitioners. There are no spiritual vitamins for a run-down religion. The Divine Surgeon must use His scalpel of pain and penance on ■ few willing victims who will suffer for all, or apply some harsh shock treatment to the multitude and drive them down again to their knees.

We can, however, explore and diagnose some of the minor ailments and suggest remedies. First of all, mission vocations must be cultivated.

Some few grow in the wild and develop without much gardening or watering except from God's special grace. Most vocations sprout as a family culture where parents are holy and devout. They are nurtured and take shape more promptly in the climate of religious education. A study of the question based on ■ poll of many students and Sisters has shown that decision for a religious calling is made in the sixth or seventh grade, in the majority of cases. Approach, encouragement and general direction for vocations should begin at this time. Influences on the lives of pupils from then through the next years direct them towards the priesthood at home, the religious life or the missions.

Wise direction, guidance and advice at this time help the youngster find his proper place in the religious world. Only very stupid and short-sighted men will try to channel all vocations into one kind of religious life, one society, or the diocesan clergy. He who does should prepare to see many misfits, casualties and wrecks. One who may be a dismal failure on the missions could be ■ very fine priest at home. An unhappy man in the restrictions of community life could be a dynamo by himself in a parish.

It is necessary to weigh the qualifications and temperament of ■ young candidate against parish duties or the specialized work of religious societies

to see how he will fit. Also needful for consideration is the distinctive mold, tone or spirit of the religious societies, for there is the old problem of the peg and the hole. A little observation when associating with members of different religious societies shows each to have a distinctive character, or individuality. The society molds its men to a kind of type, or perhaps it is the men in the society who make the distinctive mold. Anyway, the members are found to have a tag of special characteristic marks on their bearing that one quickly recognizes as Dominican, Jesuit, Franciscan, Salesian, etc. All these things merit consideration in directing a boy to the life where he will fit best.

Vocational direction is the work of a specialist in the diocese or the religious society. It is also in the province and duty of Propagation of the Faith

directors to find and encourage mission vocations. Some see their duty only as fund collectors for the missions. But sending out vocation literature or giving vocation talks to students is not beyond their duty.

Mission education is an essential which spades up the ground for vocations to grow in. This naturally falls to the lot of mission societies and Propagation of the Faith directors. Unless mission magazines and literature are sent into the homes and schools, the task of mission education goes undone.

America has been generous with her funds and the Propagation of the Faith directors have been a blessing in encouraging and gathering them. However, missions live not by gold alone, they need blood as well. Monetary treasure, helpful or necessary as it may be, is no substitute for sons and daughters.

### *Baby-Sitter Pledge*

I have one of the most responsible jobs in the world. I am in charge of a priceless possession. From the moment I start my duties until the parents return, I will keep awake, alert, watchful. I will be prepared to meet any emergency, accident or illness. I will know how and where to call the doctor, the police, the fire department, the telephone number where the parents, near friends or neighbors may be reached.

I will know how to care properly for simple burns, cuts and bruises. When entering a strange house, I will take careful note of my surroundings, and will observe, and if possible correct, any condition that may cause an accident during my presence. I am fully aware that a child's life is in my hands. I will do all in my power to protect that life.—THE EVANGELIST, *Albany, N. Y.*, May 7, 1954.



# “Asia for the Asians”

RAUL S. MANGLAPUS

*An address delivered over radio station DZBB, Manila, P. I., April 18, 1954.*

**I**T IS fortunate for me that I should be asked to address you on this Easter Day. The subject about which I have been eager to speak for some time could not find a more adequate starting point than the Resurrection.

Easter Sunday is a general day of rejoicing for us Filipinos. The return of Christ from the grave confirms the divinity of the Christian religion, which is the broad basis of the culture of our people.

Of late, however, the word has been passed around that we as a people, after all, have no culture to speak of, or that, at best, we are possessed of a deficient sort of culture—a culture alloyed, a culture not purely indigenous, not totally Filipino, or, at least, not totally Asian, and therefore not really culture at all. I understand that this type of thinking is fomented by some eloquent foreign Asian observers and has been taken up, consciously or subconsciously, by highly respected elements in our country.

Tested under this stringent formula, Christianity is ruled out for being an improper ingredient in our

*Mr. Manglapus, a Manila lawyer, suffered imprisonment and torture at the hands of the Japanese during World War II. An outstanding Catholic layman, he is vice-chairman of the Citizen Party.*

culture, because, although it has provided a solid basis for our *mores* and our way of life, although it has given beauty and meaning to our existence, although it has taught us to love our fellow man, although it was, in fact, born in Asia and therefore was originally Asian, it was unfortunately brought to us by non-Filipinos and, what to these observers is apparently fatal, by non-Asians!

Democracy makes a reality the universal aspirations of the human race for freedom. To reach the stage of practising it is to attain an undeniable cultural advantage over peoples not quite so advanced. But our brand of democracy, it is said, is imported from non-Asian sources, and therefore that too is to be discounted from our cultural make-up.

It is not difficult to place the fal-

lacy in these observations. They are founded on ■ regionalization of truth, goodness, beauty and all the other elements that compose the totality of any national culture.

### A NATION'S CULTURE

No civilization, Asian or otherwise, has a monopoly on truth, on goodness or on beauty. A nation's culture grows rich and matures as quickly as it absorbs and makes its own the good, the true and the beautiful from other nations, whether neighboring or ten thousand miles away. Deliberately to refuse to learn from others is by so much to impoverish oneself.

The nations of Europe are none the less cultured because their culture was not originally their own but that of the two ancient civilizations of Rome and Greece, humanized by a Faith that was originally from Asia. Ancient Greece itself was none the less civilized because her first philosophers thrived in Greek Ionia in Asia Minor. I am certain the Hungarians and the Finns are none the less proud of their languages because they are rooted in the Mongolian tongue. Spain, proud Spain, that glories as ■ bastion of Catholic Christianity, is just as proud of the things of beauty left on its southern shores by the invading Asiatic Mohammedan.

We turn to Asia, and we think of Japan and the *samurai* and *bushido* and say: "What wonderfully pure

culture!" We forget that the culture of Japan was enriched in instalments by slow sailboat from China and Korea, until Perry forced her open to the influences of other Asian civilizations and to the culture of the West, and put her on the road to world power.

The culture of India was not all home grown. There aboriginal tree-worshipping was modified first by invading Aryans from the north who turned their worship to the sun and the sky. Then evolved Hinduism, in which all is Brahma and what is not Brahma is nothing. Thence was born Buddhism, which was originally a heresy from Hinduism. And then from Arabia came Islam with crescent and sword—and then Christianity, first the Nestorian heresy and then Roman Catholicism. India did not begin to be a nation until the European unified it. For until the Englishmen Clive and Hastings brought all the principalities together under one flag, the Indians were subjects of big and little moguls who held absolute sway within their big and little realms. And the immortal Gandhi learned his concrete ideas on constitutional liberty and law, not in the temples of nihilistic Hinduism, but in the classrooms of Oxford University.

Now we are asked to admit that we have no culture at all because we have allowed non-Asian influences to dilute our genuine Filipino culture.



But, we might ask, what would genuine Filipino culture be? Only what is native? What is truly Filipino? But what is truly Filipino? Before the sixteenth century there was no Filipino at all, no Philippines—just a group of seven thousand islands, intermittently invaded by Negritos, Indonesians, Proto-Malays, Malays, and swept by the tide of Southeast Asian Empires — the Shri-Vishaya, the Madjapahit — and the Chinese of the Mings. Until a more lasting foreign control, that of Spain's, paradoxically united the islands' inhabitants into one people, gave them a Faith and a name, the Filipino as he is known today was just a gleam in the eye of the Creator.

And so it is with other peoples. There was no Englishman until the Black Death of the fourteenth century, and no American until the seventeenth century, when people fleeing persecution in Europe landed and erected free communities on the coasts of the new world. Today's Englishman is not the primitive Druid that the Iberians found on the isles northwest of the continent. He is the product of the law and order that the Romans implanted, the adventurous spirit of the Celts, the village institutions of the Anglo-Saxons, the proud traditions of the Normans, and the Faith that came from Asia. Today's American is not the war-painted tribesman whom the Pilgrims met. Today's American has

many traits from many lands — the passion for constitutional freedom from England, the weakness for rhythmic music from the African, the hardness from the war-painted tribesman, from the European continent the Faith which ~~was~~ born in Asia.

Indeed, if the purist theory of culture were stretched to its logical conclusions, then we would have the following resumés of national cultures: English culture is human sacrifice at the Druidic altar; Indian culture is the self-immolation of the widowed spouse; American culture is scalping; and Filipino culture is head-hunting.

### NEUTRALISM

Confronted with these absurdities, one is tempted to dismiss the whole matter as an issue, after all, of no important consequence. Would it were so. Unfortunately, this point of history, apparently merely academic, is today raised as a subtle overture to a point of world politics, a philosophy in international relations. The idea that there is no goodness, truth or beauty appropriate to a country except that which is born within it, the idea that a nation to be worthy of its name should thrust its collective head into the sands of its own past, oblivious of what benefits, or dangers, the winds of the present might blow its way — this idea, false and impractical, is now translated in-

to political slogans to justify neutralism in the area of international relations. Cultural self-sufficiency has been made a cult to be observed and defended in speech and in writing at all costs, and now provides an excuse for evasive teetering in foreign relations. The real, the live global issues are ignored, and in their place old, sure-fire emotional slogans are revived to clothe a policy of neutrality in the face of the good and the evil.

Some years ago, an Asian leader revived one such slogan — "Asia for the Asians." It has now been taken up and suggested as the core of our foreign policy by some of our responsible and respected leaders. The phrase is admirable as a slogan. It has the emotional potentialities. It is a logical corollary of the fallacy of cultural self-sufficiency and purism. But it will not do as a principle on which to base official action. It is ambiguous. A statement is ambiguous when it is susceptible of many meanings and does not by itself supply any clue as to what is really meant.

### IMPORTANT THINGS

"Asia for the Asians" can mean any number of things, the most important of which, we might say, are the following:

1. It can mean a *platitude*, which nobody would care to deny; namely, that the various Asian nations have a prior claim to the land and re-

sources of the territories which they at present justly occupy.

2. It can mean a *truth*, which, however, needs to be very carefully defined; namely, that the various Asian nations have the right to exclude other nations (including other *Asian* nations) from partial or even total participation in the exploitation and enjoyment of their respective territories, whenever such a concession threatens their rights. The Philippine Constitution asserts this right by nationalizing the exploitation of our natural resources.

3. It can mean an *error*, which must be clearly distinguished from the platitude and the truth; namely, that it is the moral obligation of the Asian nations to use their own material, moral and cultural resources or that of other Asian nations, exclusively; that is, to the exclusion of the possible material, moral and cultural contributions of other, especially Western, nations. This is the cultural exclusivism which we have exposed as a false and impossible theory.

No one denies the right of a country to the nationalization of its resources. And there is no need for slogans to implement our own Constitutional provisions on it. Wise and dispassionate legislation can do that. No one of any consequence in world politics now questions the right of the Asian nations to a prior claim to their lands and resources. Since



the end of the last war, one Asian nation after another has gained its independence, so that Asian self-determination is now no longer an issue but a fact. In some instances, the accomplishment of the fact has been slow and cautious, but the policy is here in the part of Asia that concerns us — the Southeast.

To flaunt "Asia for the Asians" as our basic foreign policy, as a challenge to the West, to point to little pockets of continued Western domination in support of this cry, while ignoring the great religious, political, military and diplomatic struggle in which the Western nations and all the other free nations of the earth are engaged to preserve world freedom and godliness, is to distort the international picture, to fan dying embers into flame so that the fire may distract the populace from the real calamity that is without and even within their gates.

### DANGER TO HUMANITY

We are asked to permit ourselves to be drawn into the orbit of neutralism over which holds sway Jawaharlal Nehru, the great Indian leader whom we respect but with whose policy we must disagree. We are asked to revive the outworn nineteenth-century cult of nationalism, when it is not nationality that is today in danger but something even more fundamental — humanity. Atheistic Communism does not seek to destroy na-

tions or states, for it has use for these instruments of collectivism. Atheistic Communism would abolish, rather, the human person. We are not faced with an imperialism of the 1800's, which would have contented itself with exploiting other peoples' lands. This is the new imperialism which seeks to exploit and destroy all peoples' minds, bodies and souls.

Yet we are asked to believe that our foreign policy should concern itself with petty violations of Philippine or Asian dignity in United States bases. "And why not?" it is asked. Are not violations of Asian dignity in U. S. bases real, international problems, and is not Asia but an innocent bystander in the struggle between the two imperialisms of Anglo-America and Russia? Would not, therefore, our best policy be to avoid involvement? Shall we threaten the Communists and arouse their enmity? Shall we take on an enemy that is too big for us? Is it not safer to challenge our allies, instead, and remind them of their own past and present sins?

Fellow countrymen, it cannot be our main objective to avoid involvement in this struggle. *We are already involved in it.* Our very souls are in pawn. Shall we proclaim neutrality while within our very shores Communists have already taken up arms against us? Shall we proclaim neutrality when only five flying hours away a great nation lies prostrate

under the heels of the Red invader, the millions of her youth trained daily to hate, to fight, to invade for Communism? Shall we proclaim neutrality between good and evil, between freedom and slavery, between God and anti-God?

To take sides with freedom, we need not threaten the enemy. We need not provoke him; he needs no provocation. We need only state our stand simply, unequivocally, fear-

lessly. We need only call red, red; evil, evil. We need only clear the air of slogans and sit down with our friends, Asian or non-Asian, and plot a sound, rational course of mutual defense.

Yes, we might even take a lesson from the Man who rose from the dead almost two thousand years ago today. Where would humanity be had He *too* chosen neutrality and slogans—instead of the Cross?



### *Fighting Communism*

In our struggle against Communists and their activities in America we must never step down to the level of using tactics which can be approved only on principles sanctioned by the Communists. An abuse of truth and justice cannot be justified on the grounds that it is used in a good cause. Time after time the Church has roundly condemned as immoral the proposition that the end justifies the means. In a nation which has built the protection of the liberty and freedom of every citizen into its Constitutional framework, methods and means are of fundamental importance.

*Every informed American whose intellect functions normally abhors Communism.* In the past we have risen as one to defeat any threat to our liberty. Today, too, before the most serious threat to our freedoms, we must stand as one. Today we must not be divided by the seeds of hatred and distrust, by denunciations without proof, by a climate of hysteria and fear which can but lower our stature and dignity as a nation and destroy the constructive efforts of our struggle against Communism. Indeed, if in that struggle we tarnish the armor of our liberties, if we blunt the sharp edge of the barrier between what is right and what is wrong, then we shall already have lost the blessing of God on our efforts.—*The Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly in the CALDRON, New Haven, Conn., June 15, 1954.*



# Religion Now?

G. J. GUSTAFSON, S.S.

*Reprinted from THE PRIEST\**

OF THE famous and influential President Eliot of Harvard University his latest successor wrote recently:

The enemies to his true faith were churches, creeds, priests, anything supernatural, any concern for a life after death, anything that professed to be sacramental. I suspect, for example—though I do not know this—that he would have considered the doctrine central to generations of believers, that Christ came into the world to save sinners, as so much twaddle. His was to be a “simple and rational faith” and there was to be no place in it for “metaphysical complexities or magical rites.” (Nathan M. Pusey, “A Religion for Now,” *Harper's*, Dec. '53, p. 20).

There can really be little doubt of the correctness and fairness of President Pusey's analysis of the mental attitudes of old President Eliot of a Harvard that seems to have had its day. Perhaps one cannot find explicit verification of this imputation in any written record but there can be little question of the pervasive rationalism of the American education of his day.

This was the educational age of President Andrew D. White of Cornell, author of the deleterious *History*

*of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, and of John W. Draper of New York University, author of the widely read and anti-clerical *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, both vociferous issues out of the then prevalent Positivism of Auguste Comte. This was the dawn of a vaunted day of science when many men felt that the golden age was just around the corner.

Religion was not rejected at all; it was simply changed from top to bottom. “Science is a religion” proclaimed Renan lyrically:

Science alone will be able to set down the creed of the future. Science alone can furnish man the solution of the eternal enigmas for which his nature imperiously demands an answer.

Unfortunately the new religion so often demanded the death of the old; naturalism proclaimed itself the open enemy of supernaturalism for most of these men. The ancient synthesis of an Aquinas had long been lost so that nineteenth-century thinkers tended to take irreconcilable sides in an agonizing Either/Or. Faith and science were *de facto* often at war

\* Huntington, Ind., January, 1954

and it appeared for long that science had won the day.

### COLONEL INGERSOLL

The most fanatical followers of science, men like Haeckel, threw all scientific caution to the winds and were bent simply on destroying the religious heritage of the past. Father Wasmann, the Jesuit biologist who so painstakingly sought to reconcile faith and science, branded Haeckel as a "leader of a corps of free-lancers and free-booters conspicuous for the disturbance which they caused in the name of science." In his shrewd understanding of what they were really about, he wrote bitterly: "Their weapons are not of the best and noblest sort and their aim is not the triumph of truth but rather the plunder of the Christian camp, which they suspect to be situated somewhere in the rear of their opponent's position." It is not irrelevant to recall here the bitter campaign of our own Colonel Robert B. Ingersoll; fatuous as it was at times, it was not without significance in its setting.

### HORACE MANN

This, too, was the age of Horace Mann, a controversial figure who may easily be misunderstood: hailed as he often is as the great American educator, father of our public school system, itself the bulwark of democracy; or cursed as a despoiler of religion, its avowed and implacable en-

emy, and the chief disruptive force in American educational history. The fact seems to be that he was neither the one nor the other, but a man of ideals, if somewhat mistaken ones, who sought to generalize educational opportunities at public expense, and to raise professional standards.

Most of all he was a child of his times. Caught midway in a religious dispute in Massachusetts between Congregationalists and Unitarians, he tried to settle the controversy by disastrous compromise: there should be no religious instruction in the public schools at all! That this had done incalculable harm we would be the last to deny, but that his mistake had deep roots in his own era must also be recognized. His hatred of sectarianism is not altogether inexplicable: he was not only confronted by an acrid public dispute but he was also the heir of a persistent American "liberalism" that goes back to Jefferson and Franklin.

It is necessary in fairness to note that Mann the idealist, the dreamer, seems to have believed that he really had found a way out and there is a pathetic note of sincerity in his extravagant claim:

The common school is the institution which can receive and train up children in the elements of all good knowledge and virtue before they are subjected to the alienating competitions of life. This institution is the greatest discovery ever made by man; we repeat it, the



common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man . . .

This sincerity in idealism also marked the career of President Eliot. President Pusey recognizes in him a deep personal faith and a noble one, grants even that "much of the University's present stature is owed to it."

What was that faith *in concreto*? Let a somewhat long quotation from an address Eliot gave to the Divinity School in 1909 serve as a fair sample. The address was entitled "The Religion of the Future." Incidentally, it was the last time a president of the University participated in an exercise of the Divinity School till President Pusey answered Eliot in 1953 with his exposition, "A Religion for Now."

Said Eliot, and the discourse sounds almost truculent:

The new religion will foster powerfully a virtue which is comparatively new in the world—the love of truth and the passion for seeking it.

And again:

The workman today who gets cut or bruised by a rough or dirty instrument goes to a surgeon, who applies an antiseptic dressing to the wound and prevents the poisoning. That surgeon is one of the ministers of the new religion. When dwellers in a slum suffer the familiar evils caused by overcrowding, impure food and cheerless labor, the modern true believers contend against the sources of such misery by providing public baths, playgrounds, wider and cleaner streets, better dwellings and more effective schools—that is, they at-

tack the sources of physical and moral evil.

Eliot and Mann are actually of a piece. It is their faith which largely underlay the tremendous expansion in a secular and non-sectarian way of the whole public school system, which resulted in the so-called "philosophy of the Little Red School House," and the implicit and sometimes explicit rejection, as inadequate, of parochial schools.

John Dewey merely went a step beyond but in the same direction. His god was society but he was to be worshipped in a way which was now completely positivistic and, in addition, "democratic"—though it would be hard in a short essay to show all that has happened to that venerable term. His positivism lay in his complete confidence in science to solve all problems; his "democracy" may be sampled in his oft-quoted dictum that man "lives in, for and by society." Wiser men have not hesitated to call this totalitarianism.

### FRANKENSTEIN'S MONSTER

We spoke earlier of a Harvard "that seems to have had its day." What can that possibly mean? Not the sudden end of a great University in any case; but its possible transformation and renovation from the top down. We referred also to Dr. Pusey's address to the ~~same~~ Divinity School as an answer, in 1953, to the genial and, to us, naive optimism of

a man who confidently greeted the millenium in 1909.

Eliot was a man who lived long before two world wars, the atom bomb, Korea and the current confusion. It was fairly easy in 1909 to apostrophize public baths and playgrounds and the prevention of blood poisoning. It is not so easy in 1954, as we face the perils of a new year, to be complacent about mere plumbing or to get enthusiastic about the further dissemination of a wonderfully effective science which threatens the very life that begot it—Frankenstein's Monster.

President Pusey says all this better than we can. His very saying it probably means more than any number of editorials that Catholics could write, for he is president of Harvard University and we Catholics still belong to an offensive educational minority who shall be heard reluctantly or not at all.

One must indeed add, to be true to the facts of American history, that we seem to be quite commonly regarded as incapable of the truth. "In all this country," said George Shuster in 1927, "there is not a single literary or philosophic newspaper page of which one can say that it is written by a convinced Catholic or even an uncompromising Christian," (*The Catholic Spirit in America*, p. 167). This may no longer be correct, but one hesitates to deny that "among those who are creating public con-

sciousness in contemporary America, for better or for worse, singularly few stand inside the pale of the Church."

Here, in our eyes, lies the importance of President Pusey's rejection of what has long been established doctrine; hence, the intrinsic interest of this new heresy of his: "This faith will no longer do"; and his forthright statement, "Our need is not for a religion for the future but for religion now; for the vigorous and creative faith which Eliot and his generation had has in considerable measure spent its force, and in many areas, in many minds, a paralyzing disbelief has taken its place." What does he propose in its stead?

It is by no means the rejection of science and the scrapping of its achievements. He would, rather, have them placed at long last back in their traditional ethical and religious context for control. There is nothing wrong with atomic energy; there can be something terribly wrong with its possible uses. Pusey puts it this way:

It is leadership in religious knowledge, and even more, in religious experience—not increased industrial might, not more research facilities, certainly not these things by themselves—of which we now have a most gaping need.

The error of Eliot is the fallacy so many, many times exposed, first by Aristotle, most recently by Pusey, that there is no escape from "metaphysical complexities." Like the man



caught in quicksand, struggle here only plunges one in deeper, finally to the point of disaster. "It has now become frighteningly clear," says Pusey, "that if you try to ignore metaphysical considerations [I would say consideration of ultimate things] or cover them up in bursts of energy, they will rise up in perverted and distorted forms to mock one's thus too-circumscribed efforts."

#### CARDINAL NEWMAN

The merit of President Pusey is thus his open avowal as president of Harvard University of the position so eloquently espoused by Cardinal Newman in his *Idea of a University*, a position essentially medieval, yet a position very pertinent to modern times, as the Cardinal foresaw in his own struggle against "liberalism," namely, that theology is the queen of the sciences.

It is good to hear, in 1953, the president of a great university ask for a revitalization of theology and plead in its behalf for a "fresh impetus and a new life." As he has said so eloquently:

Theology should not be thought of as  
■ minor intellectual exercise among

other intellectual exercises—certainly not only this. It is expected to carry an answer to our deepest hungers and need.

Whether it shall or not depends in large part on the quality of the theologians of our day, upon their awareness of the temper of these times; their ability to meet present needs. Theirs is no slight role or light burden.

As for the more mundane area of education, it is not yet possible to gauge the effect of President Pusey's words. But this address may one day be cited as the sign of a turning point. The American public, to whom the schools are legally responsible, is coming to see more and more clearly the shortcomings of the attitudes of an Eliot or a Mann.

Pusey did not go this far; but is it naive to hope that that same public may come one day to see right through the fallacious and devious distortions of the doctrine of the separation of Church and State and of disestablishment, as American educators have used it? "In America" wrote Theodore Maynard, in *The Story of American Catholicism*, "the only thing established and subsidized is irreligion."



"Natural slumber differs from every other state, and neither hypnosis nor drugs can produce a condition comparable to it. We do not know what it is, but we cannot live without it. Sleep remains a nightly miracle that baffles science."—Webb Harrison in the *MARIANIST*, Dayton, Ohio, March, 1954.

# The Decree on the Eucharistic Fast

THE REV. SHAWN G. SHEEHAN

*Reprinted from* MEDIATOR\*

**I**T HAS taken most of us some time to realize the significance of the new decree on the Eucharistic fast. Gradually we have come to see that the very issuing of this decree is a proof that the age of frequent Communion is definitely established and is already far advanced. The hopes of Blessed Pius X are being fulfilled.

Such a decree would hardly have been considered fifty years ago. At that time most people received Holy Communion only three or four times a year. Only a very few received as often as once a week. Children were not generally admitted to the holy table. The big problem then was to persuade people that this Sacrament is meant to be the Food of their souls, indeed their "daily Bread." Pope Pius XII is confident that that problem is well on its way to solution and that now a new age has been established and with it has brought its own particular problems to be solved.

This new Eucharistic age is not like any other in the history of the Church. If we reach the goal set by the Popes, that all except those re-

maining in serious sin receive Holy Communion at least every Sunday, our grim age will resemble in this respect the first four centuries. In the Apostolic Constitution, *Christus Dominus*, issued on Epiphany, 1953, to announce the new legislation on the Eucharistic fast, Pius XII refers to the decrees of Blessed Pius X on frequent Communion as decrees "summoning all to renew the primitive custom of the Church." Then he continues as follows:

The faithful, responding generously and willingly to these directions of the Sovereign Pontiffs, have approached ever more frequently to the sacred table.

May this hunger for the heavenly Bread and the thirst for the Sacred Blood burn in all men of every age and of every walk of life!

But immediately the Holy Father notes that the many changes in society since the first centuries make it necessary to reconsider the law on the Eucharistic fast if men in our age are to emulate the Eucharistic devotion of those early days.

This new Eucharistic age will no doubt bring on further problems and

\* 34 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge 38, Mass.

the reconsideration of other points in the external discipline of the Sacraments. These will be welcome problems, for they will be signs that we are growing. This present decree is the second outstanding witness to the success of the Eucharistic program. The first was the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on Dec. 8, 1938, to straighten out the difficulties arising from the fact that daily Communion had become the common practice in religious communities, seminaries and in many colleges and schools.

We are still far from attaining in the parishes the stage of development that made the 1938 Instruction necessary for the closed communities. In community life the Eucharistic movement is approaching full manhood. In the parishes the problem is to help along the growing boy. How can we stir up our infrequent communicants (once-a-month, etc.) to receive Holy Communion at least every Sunday?

The present decree does not pretend to deal with the basic means by which we must carry on that work, namely, teaching the purpose of the Holy Eucharist and the meaning of the state of grace. But the Holy Father faces the fact that there are many people whose knowledge and dispositions are right but who find that the fast as it was established in the early days of the Church is too much for them.

### CHIEF PASTOR KNOWS PEOPLE'S PROBLEMS

The section of the Apostolic Constitution in which the Holy Father lists those who are kept from Communion by the fast sounds very familiar to priests. They have heard the complaints of these same people so often as they urged them—splendidly faithful souls and weak but repentant souls—to come to Holy Communion at least once a week. There are those with stomach and throat ailments, the expectant mothers, and so many others who could not observe the fast. They were not quite up to going through the procedure for obtaining a dispensation, but now that the confessor can take care of them directly they can be much more easily persuaded to take part in the sacred banquet regularly. The same is true of those whose lives are dislocated by the weird hours observed in our industrial society. We have often prayed that something could be done for the mothers who can only get to a late Mass after a busy morning of caring for the baby, getting the children out to their Mass, cooking breakfasts, and so on. We have wondered what should be done for the public school children who attend Sunday school after the children's Mass. Many of them are too young to observe an absolute fast for so long every Sunday. No longer must we disappointedly give these various people the feeble admonition, "Come to Communion



when you can." The Supreme Pastor has thought of them all. While even in our city parishes there are many who will benefit by the new concessions, we can well imagine what a tremendous boon this decree is to those who are in rural and missionary areas.

### CHALLENGE TO PRIESTS

The new concessions will not work wonders. The basic work in the Eucharistic apostolate must go on. Perhaps one of the chief virtues of the new decree is that it is bringing many of us back to a clearer view of the goal toward which we should be striving. It has proved to us how really earnest the Holy Father is about having us make the effort to persuade people to receive Holy Communion each time they attend Mass. In the Apostolic Constitution, *Christus Dominus*, he says:

We, by this decree, trust that we may be able to add not a little to the increase of Eucharistic piety, and in this way to move and stir up all to partake at the table of the angels.

This, without doubt, will increase the glory of God and the holiness of the Mystical Body of Christ.

As we study the new decree we are led to review the decrees of Blessed Pius X and the writings of the theologians on frequent Communion. We find that Blessed Pius X starts off his first decree with a canon of Trent which reads as follows: "The Holy Council wishes indeed that at each

Mass the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but sacramentally, by the actual reception of the Eucharist." Blessed Pius X himself speaks of "the desire of Jesus Christ and of the Church that all the faithful should daily approach the sacred banquet."

We learn from theologians that in official documents the words, "frequent Communion," have a definite meaning, namely, the reception of Holy Communion more than once a week. We are also aware that the law as stated in the Code of Canon Law is as follows: "The faithful should be made eager (*excitentur fideles*) to receive Holy Communion frequently, even daily, according to the regulations given in the decrees of the Apostolic See, and as often as they assist at Mass to communicate, not only by spiritual desire, but also sacramentally, by receiving the Holy Eucharist."

We must never, of course, be unmindful of the safeguards against improper reception of the Holy Eucharist. We must teach constantly the dispositions required for the fruitful reception of this Sacrament. We must never give the impression that frequent or even weekly Communion is a matter of obedience to any prescription of Church law. The law on frequent Communion is addressed to bishops and priests (and indirectly to teachers, parents, etc.), prescribing that we should instruct the minds and

stir up the hearts of the faithful so that they will approach the holy table frequently from their own piety and devotion.

Whatever the practice of the faithful has been in any age, the official pronouncements of the Church have always urged the reception of Holy Communion by all at least every Sunday. Today we are receiving special and urgent commands to strive for the fulfillment of the law as stated. Moreover, we are assured by the watchman on the tower of Peter that this time success is in sight.

Our Holy Father, Pius XII, has already made an eloquent appeal for the extension of frequent Communion in his encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, writing as follows:

May God grant that all accept these invitations of the Church freely and with spontaneity. May He grant that they participate even every day, if possible, in the divine Sacrifice, not only in a spiritual manner, but also by reception of the august Sacrament, receiving the Body of Jesus Christ which has been offered for all to the Eternal Father. Arouse, Venerable Brethren, in the hearts of those committed in your care, a great and insatiable hunger for Jesus Christ. Under your guidance let the children and youth crowd to the altar rails to offer themselves, their innocence and their works of zeal to the Divine Redeemer. Let husbands and wives approach the holy table so that nourished on this food they may learn to make the children entrusted to them conformed to the mind and heart of Jesus Christ.

Let the workers be invited to partake of this sustaining and never failing

nourishment that it may renew their strength and obtain for their labors an everlasting recompense in heaven; in a word, invite all men of whatever class and compel them to come in; since this is the Bread of life which all require. The Church of Jesus Christ needs no other bread than this to satisfy fully our souls' wants and desires, and to unite us in the most intimate union with Jesus Christ, to make us "one body," to get us to live together as brothers who, breaking the same bread, sit down to the same Heavenly Table to partake of the elixir of immortality.

#### PARTAKERS OF THE SACRIFICE

In *Mediator Dei* the Holy Father emphasizes the reception of Holy Communion as participation in the Holy Sacrifice. In the Apostolic Constitution, *Christus Dominus*, he writes: "Since all must recognize that the Eucharist 'has been instituted as the permanent memorial of the Passion' (St. Thos., Lect. 4, Corpus Christi), let them from their hearts elicit those sentiments of Christian humility and Christian patience which meditation on the sufferings and death of our Divine Redeemer must arouse." In *Mediator Dei* he presents a careful study of the part which the faithful have in the Mass as victims united with the Divine Victim and also of the truth that they are partakers of the Sacrifice itself by receiving Holy Communion.

Another reason for the Holy Father's zeal for frequent Communion is seen in the words we have quoted above from the encyclical,

where he speaks of the Eucharist as the Sacrament of our union with one another. In *Christus Dominus* he puts special emphasis on this point, saying:

Also, to our Divine Redeemer who, ever immolating Himself on our altars, is repeating the greatest proof of his love, let all offer increased fruits of charity toward their neighbors.

For this reason all shall cooperate toward daily fulfilling the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "Because the bread is one, we, though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10:17).

### THE MYSTICAL BODY

These words of the Holy Father link up the new decree with his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, in which he exposes the wonderful riches of that Body through which flows the divine life from Christ the Head. In that encyclical he speaks at length of the Eucharist as the Sacrament in which "the faithful are nourished and grow strong at the same table, and in a divine, ineffable way are brought into union with each other and with the divine Head of the whole Body" (paragraph 20; cf. 88-91). In the introduction to the same encyclical he points out that the revival of frequent Communion has been one of the chief causes for the renewed appreciation of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

A review of *Mystici Corporis* and *Mediator Dei* is certainly called for if we are to see the new decree in its

proper setting and if we are to obey the following admonition given us by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office in the Instruction explaining the new legislation on the fast:

Ordinaries and priests should know how to take advantage of the benevolent concession of the Holy See for exhorting the faithful to assist at Mass frequently and to receive Holy Communion and promote with opportune measures, especially preaching, that spiritual good in view of which the Holy Father, Pius XII, has promulgated the constitution.

In regard to teaching the details of the new legislation, our study of *Christus Dominus* will impel us first to teach the meaning and importance of the Eucharistic fast. How long is it since any of us has heard—or has given—an instruction on this topic? The force of the law is re-affirmed in the new decree. There is a slight change in the law itself, to eliminate the prohibition against drinking water, and concessions are made for people in certain conditions. But the force of the law remains. The reasons for the fast are reviewed by the Holy Father, namely, the avoidance of such abuses as St. Paul found at Corinth, the reverence due to Christ, the manifestation of our faith that this Bread of Life is our first and chief nourishment, and the mortification of the flesh so that the soul may be freer to dwell on the divine mysteries and to grow in virtue.

In teaching that the law is changed so that the drinking of water no



longer breaks the fast, we should make it clear that this provision is incorporated in the law itself as "a general and common principle for all." It is not listed among the special concessions. It is a concession now only in the historical sense, to be classified, for example, with the concession long since made by the Church that on fast days we may eat a light breakfast and a collation besides our one real meal.

As for the concessions granted to persons in certain conditions, the Holy Office instructs us that we should know how to take advantage of them to increase the reception of Holy Communion. We are charged also to avoid any interpretation that would stretch these concessions beyond what is actually granted and to take care that there is no abuse or irreverence toward the Blessed Sacrament.

Priests must acquaint themselves thoroughly with the details of the regulations. The laity should be made familiar with the fact that these concessions have been granted by the Supreme Pastor and they should be encouraged to seek the decision of a priest whenever they think they may be entitled to a concession. Also, it should be impressed on them clearly and repeatedly that no individual can use these concessions without consulting a priest (one with faculties as a confessor) privately and receiving his decision on the matter. Furthermore it must be clear that a person

cannot use a concession when the conditions for its being granted cease to exist, even though only temporarily.

### ADMONITIONS TO GREATER DEVOTION

Having always in mind the fact that this decree aims to foster growth in piety, we must not overlook the following exhortation of the Holy Father:

Besides, as often as the inconvenience of the body is diminished, the soul must supply as far as it can, either by internal penance or by other means, in accordance with the traditional custom of the Church, which is wont to command other works to be done when it mitigates the fast.

Hence, those who may enjoy the faculties granted in this matter should raise fervent prayers to Heaven to adore God, to thank Him, and especially to expiate for sins and beg Him for new Heavenly aid.

With this admonition we should join those which the Holy Father addresses to all of us in the next few paragraphs of the Constitution on the spirit of sacrifice and of charity that is called for by the fact that the Eucharist is the memorial of the Passion and the Sacrament of the unity of the Mystical Body.

It all goes together—frequent Communion, whole-hearted participation in the Mass and a realization of our unity in the Mystical Body of Christ. This is the papal program. Another integral part of it is the call to more effective justice and charity in social

action. Popes Leo XIII and Pius X inaugurated a new age. The Holy Spirit guides the Church in the fulfillment of its mission in the twentieth century as He has guided it in other centuries. The present decree fits into the pattern. It is a decree on frequent Communion. As the essential objectives of the papal program are achieved there is need for adjustments in accidental forms. The new legislation is definitely part of a uni-

versal program. The Holy Father makes that clear. If it were an answer to regional problems, it would be handled through particular indults. The fact of the matter is that we are in sight of the goal—that at each Mass the faithful who are present will receive Communion—and the Holy Father is shaping the law in view of that development. The new decree is actually a witness to the great vigor of the Church in our day.



### *Religion Still Lives*

Communist leaders have been worried of late because their young people are lax in using their “freedom for anti-religious propaganda.”

A recent news release from East Berlin had this to say about the situation:

The freedom for anti-religious propaganda contained in the Soviet Constitution is not just a freedom but a duty for the 18 million members of the Youth League. According to the Soviet system, from these 18 million members will rise the future rulers of the vast Soviet empire. Anti-religious propaganda in the Komsomol (Youth League) has been seriously weakened and in some places it has stopped completely. Some Komsomol leaders underestimate the injurious influence of religion on youth and children, and this negligence by Komsomol officials has resulted in the fact that many youths have fallen prey to “religious ideology.”

Speakers at the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party complained at a recent meeting “that too many party members in rural districts still were going to church.”

A news dispatch from Belgrade reads: “Among the 70,000 Communists purged from the party rolls in the last 16 months, it was reported, were cases of “religious feeling.” One person purged at Kraguivavas, Serbia, it was said, even became a “religious mystic.” A leading party official from Bosnia urged that care be taken to distinguish between the party member who goes to church out of religious convictions and one who attends merely because it is local custom.—CATHOLIC OBSERVER, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, June 12, 1954.

## Documentation

# Canonization of Pius X

POPE PIUS XII

*Address during the canonization rites, May 29, 1954*

**T**HIS hour of splendid triumph—as God, Who lifts up the lowly, has arranged and, as it were, hastened in order to set His seal on the marvelous elevation of His faithful servant Pius X, to the supreme glory of the altars—fills Our heart with joy, a joy in which you, Venerable Brothers and beloved sons, share abundantly by your presence here. We offer heartfelt thanks then to God in His goodness for allowing Us to take part in this extraordinary event; all the more so since, for perhaps the first time in the history of the Church, the formal canonization of a Pope is proclaimed by one who had the privilege of serving him in the Roman Curia.

This day is blessed and memorable, not only for Us, who count it among the happiest days of Our Pontificate, to which Providence has allotted so many sorrows and cares, but also for the entire Church, which, gathered around Us in spirit, rejoices all together in a great thrill of religious feeling.

This wonderful evening the endearing name of Pius X, pronounced in most diverse accents, spans the whole earth. It resounds in enduring testimony to the fruitful presence of Christ in His Church by evoking everywhere aspirations to sanctity, great graces of faith, of purity, of devotion to the Holy Eucharist. God, Who rewards with liberality, bears witness to His servant's lofty sanctity in exalting him. It was this sanctity, even more than the supreme office he held, that made Pius X an outstanding hero of the Church and as such today the Saint raised up by Providence for our times.

Now it is precisely in this light that We wish you to contemplate the gigantic and yet humble figure of the holy Pope so that when the shadows of this memorable day fall and the cries of the immense hosannas fade away, the solemn rite of his canonization may linger to bless your souls and help in saving the world.

## I. Program of Pius X

He solemnly announced the program of his pontificate in his very first encyclical (*E Supremi* of October 4, 1903) in which he declared that his



only aim was "to re-establish all things in Christ" (Eph. 1, 10), that is, to sum up, to restore all things to unity in Christ. But where is the road that leads to Christ, he asked himself, looking in compassion at the hesitating, wandering souls of his time? The answer, valid yesterday as well as today and always, is: the Church. His primary aim then, unceasingly pursued till death, was to make the Church ever more effectually suitable and ready to receive the movement of souls toward Jesus Christ. With this aim he conceived the bold undertaking of recasting the body of Church law in such wise as to give the Church a more ordered life, greater certainty and flexibility of movement, such as was demanded by an age typified by growing dynamism and complexity.

It is surely true that this work, which he himself called "truly an arduous task," was consonant with his eminent practical sense and the vigor of his character. Nevertheless, the ultimate reason for his undertaking this difficult task is not, it seems, to be found only in the temperament of the man. The well-spring of the legislative work of Pius X is to be looked for above all in his personal sanctity, in his profound personal conviction that the reality of God, which he experienced in a life of constant union, is the source and basis of all order, all justice, all law on earth. Where God is, there is order, justice and law, and conversely, all just order safeguarded by law manifests the existence of God. But what institution here below ought to demonstrate this relationship between God and law more clearly than the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ Himself?

God has blessed abundantly this work of the Holy Pontiff, so that the Code of Canon Law will remain for future ages the great monument of his pontificate and he himself will justly be hailed the providential Saint of our age.

Would that this spirit of justice and law, which Pius X gave witness to and exemplified for the modern world, could penetrate the conference halls of nations, where the most serious problems affecting the whole human family are discussed, particularly the method of banishing forever the fear of terrifying cataclysms and of guaranteeing for all peoples a lasting happy era of tranquillity and peace.

## II. Champion of Church and Saint of Our Times

In the second of his distinguished accomplishments Pius X is revealed as the indomitable champion of the Church and the providential Saint of our times. In sometimes dramatic circumstances this accomplishment resembled the struggle of a giant in defense of a priceless treasure: the internal unity of the Church in her innermost foundation, the Faith. Even from his childhood years Divine Providence was preparing the Saint in his humble family, built upon authority, good habits and the exact practice of the Faith. No doubt every other Pontiff would by virtue of the grace of state have fought and repulsed the assaults which were aimed at the very foundation of the Church. But we must recognize that the perspicuity and strength with which Pius X carried on the victorious struggle against the

errors of Modernism testify to the heroic degree with which the virtue of faith burned in his saintly heart.

Uniquely concerned that the inheritance of God be preserved intact for the flock confided to his care, the great Pontiff knew no weakness when dealing with persons of dignity or authority; nor did he manifest vacillation when confronted with alluring but false doctrines within or without the Church: nor did he betray fear lest he bring upon himself personal affronts and unjust interpretations of his pure intentions. He had the clear conviction that he was fighting for the most holy cause of God and souls. The words which the Lord addressed to the Apostle Peter are literally verified in Him: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail, and do thou . . . strengthen thy brethren" (Luke 22:32).

The promise and the command of Christ once again instill in the indefectible rock of one of His vicars the invincible courage of an athlete. It is right that the Church by conferring upon him the supreme glory in this hour and in this very place, where the ever lustrous glory of Peter has shone forth for centuries, thus uniting both one and the other in a single exaltation, should offer to Pius X her gratitude and at the same time invoke his intercession that she may be spared new conflicts of the same nature. The subject then under consideration, namely, the preservation of the close alliance between faith and science, is so noble a good for all humanity that this second great achievement of the saintly Pontiff exercises a notable influence even beyond the Catholic world.

Any theory such as Modernism which separates faith and science in their source and in their object by opposing one to the other produces in these two vital areas a schism which is so pernicious "that a little is more than death."

This consequence has been actually observed. Man who at the turn of the century was already divided within himself, and yet laboring under the delusion that he possessed his unity under the shallow appearances of harmony and happiness based upon a purely earthly progress, seemed to be rent asunder under the impact of a reality which was far different.

With watchful gaze Pius X observed the advent of this spiritual calamity of the modern world, this bitter delusion which especially affected the cultured classes. He perceived how such an apparent faith, that is, a faith not founded upon the revelation of God but rooted in a purely human soil, would lure many into atheism. Likewise he recognized the fatal destiny of a science which, contrary to nature and in voluntary limitation, interdicted the way to absolute Truth and Good, leaving to man, deprived of God and confronted with the invincible obscurity in which he found all being clothed, only the attitude of anguish or arrogance.

The Saint met this deadly evil with the only possible real salvation: Catholic and Biblical truth, the truth of faith, accepted as "reasonable service" (Rom. 12, 1) toward God and His revelation. By thus coordinating faith and science, faith as the supernatural extension and at times confirmation of science, and science as the way which leads to faith, Pius X restored

to Christians unity and peace of soul, which are the inviolable premises of life.

If today there are many who, impelled as it were by the emptiness and affliction of their abandonment, have turned to this truth and have realized it in the firm possession of the Church, they owe a debt of gratitude for this to the foresight and achievements of Pius X. In fact both believers, who enjoy the full light of truth, and those who sincerely seek truth are obligated to him for protecting truth from error. For others his firm attitude in regard to error may still remain a stone of scandal: in reality it is the ultimate service of charity rendered by a Saint, as head of the Church, to all humanity.

### III. Sanctity through the Eucharist

Sanctity, which was the inspiration and directing force of the aforementioned undertakings of Pius X, is still more clearly discernible in his personal life. Before applying it to others, he put into practice in his own life his program of unifying all things in Christ. First as a humble parish priest, then as Bishop, and finally as Supreme Pontiff he was intimately convinced that the sanctity to which God called him was priestly sanctity. For what sanctity is more pleasing to God in a priest of the new law than that which belongs to him as representative of Jesus Christ, eternal high priest, who left to his Church in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass a memorial for all time and a perpetual renovation of His sacrifice on the Cross, until He shall come for the Last Judgment (1 Cor. 11, 24-26): and Who in the Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist has given Himself as the food of the soul: "he who eats this bread shall live forever" (John 6, 59).

A priest, above all in the Eucharistic ministry: this is the most faithful portrayal of St. Pius X. To serve the mystery of the Blessed Eucharist as a priest, to fulfill the command of our Saviour "do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22, 19), was his goal. From the day of his sacred ordination until his death as Pope, he knew no other path than this in order to arrive at heroism in his love of God and to make a whole-hearted return to that Redeemer of the world Who by means of the Blessed Eucharist "poured out the wealth of His divine love on men" (Council of Trent, session XIII, chap. 2). One of the most expressive proofs of his consciousness of his priesthood was the extreme care he took to renew the dignity of divine worship. Overcoming the prejudices springing from an erroneous practice, he resolutely promoted frequent, and even daily, Communion of the faithful, and unhesitatingly led children to the banquet of the Lord, and offered them to the embrace of the God hidden on the altars. Then, the spouse of Christ experienced a new springtime of Eucharistic life.

In the profound vision which he had of the Church as a society, Pius X recognized that it was the Blessed Eucharist which had the power to nourish its intimate life substantially, and to raise it high above all other human societies. Only the Eucharist, in which God gives Himself to man, is apt to lay the foundations of a social life worthy of those who live it, cemented



more by love than by authority, rich in activity and aimed at the perfection of the individual: a life that is "hidden with Christ in God."

What a providential example for the world of today, where earthly society is becoming more and more a mystery to itself, and is feverishly trying to rediscover its soul. Let it look, then, for its model at the Church, gathered around its altars. There in the Sacrament of the Eucharist mankind really discovers and recognizes that its past, present and future are in unity in Christ (cf. Council of Trent, l. c.). Conscious of, and strong in, his solidarity with Christ and his fellow men, each member of either society, the earthly and the supernatural one, will be enabled to draw from the altar an interior life of personal dignity and personal worth, such as today is almost lost through insistence on technology and by excessive organization of existence, of work and even play. Only in the Church, the holy Pontiff seems to repeat, and for her in the Blessed Eucharist, which is "life hidden with Christ in God," is to be found the secret and source of renewed social life.

Hence follows the grave responsibility of the minister of the altar, whose duty it is to disclose to the souls the saving treasure of the Eucharist. Many indeed are the activities which a priest can exercise for the salvation of the modern world: one of them, and undoubtedly the most efficacious, and the most lasting in its effects, is to act as dispenser of the Holy Eucharist, after first nourishing himself abundantly with It. His works would cease to be sacerdotal if, even through zeal for souls, he were to put his Eucharistic vocation in a secondary place. Let priests conform their souls to the inspired wisdom of Pius X, and let them confidently exercise their whole apostolate under the sign of the Blessed Eucharist.

Similarly let religious men and women, those who live under the same roof as Jesus Christ and are daily nourished with His body, take as a safe norm in the pursuit of the sanctity proper to their state what the Holy Pontiff once declared on an important occasion, namely, that the bonds which, through their vows and community life, link them with God are not to be subordinated to any other activity, however legitimate, for the good of their neighbor (Cf. Letter to Gabriel Marie, superior general of the Christian Brothers, April 2, 1905—PIO X P. M. Act., V II pp. 87-88).

In the Blessed Eucharist the soul should strike roots for nourishing the interior life, which is not only a fundamental treasure of all souls consecrated to the Lord, but also a necessity for every Christian, whom God calls to be saved.

Without interior life any activity, however praiseworthy, is debased and becomes purely mechanical action without any vitalizing effect.

The Holy Eucharist and the interior life: this is the supreme and universal lesson which Pius X, from the height of glory, teaches in this hour to all souls. As apostle of the interior life, he becomes in the age of the machine, of technology and of organization the Saint and guide of men of our time.

St. Pius X, glory of the priesthood, light and honor of the Christian people—you in whom lowliness seemed blended with greatness, severity with mildness, simple piety with profound learning; you, Pope of the Holy

Eucharist and of the Catechism, of unsullied faith and fearless strength, turn your gaze on the Holy Church which you so loved and to which you consecrated the choicest of those treasures with which the lavish hand of the divine bounty had enriched your soul: obtain for her safety and steadfastness amid the difficulties and persecutions of our times; sustain this poor human race, whose sufferings stilled at the end the beating of your great heart; bring it about that this troubled world may witness the triumph of that peace which should mean harmony among nations, brotherly accord and sincere collaboration among the different classes of society, love and charity among individual men, so that thus those ardent desires which consumed your apostolic life may become by your intercession ■ blessed reality, to the glory of Our Lord Jesus Christ Who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, lives and reigns forever and ever, Amen.

### *Catholic Rome*

No inquiry into the degree of religious observance to be found among the Romans can answer the question, "How Catholic is Rome?" Rome is above all else the See of St. Peter and the city of the Popes; ■ city which has had this continuous character for sixteen hundred years when in all else immense changes have followed one upon the other; ■ city which has never, since its temporal rule was taken from the Pope eighty years ago, had any unity in a political sense, and has none today; a city where the only and overwhelming unity is one in devotion to the person of the Holy Father, *defensor civitatis*; the capital of ■ nation for one lifetime but the center of the world from the earliest years of the Christian era and beyond; a city of churches where the churches are never enough; where the Victor Emmanuel monument stands today as the relic of ■■ already vanished time, but where St. Peter's remains, meaning what it always meant, *urbi et orbi*.—TABLET, London, England, January 30, 1954.



### *Life-and-Death Matter*

To members of Congress, Communism in the labor movement is a subject for debate. But to me—and to other people in the labor movement—it is a matter of life and death. We do not contribute to the fight against Communism by making speeches against it. We must meet it where it is, in offices, in factories, in mines, on ships and railroads, in the secret cliques of infiltrators in locals, and in the minds and fists of misguided men. A Congressman may lose his debate without fatal consequences. But if the American laborer loses his fight against Communism, he loses his bread and butter; he loses his freedom; he loses everything that makes his life worth living.—Joseph A. Beirne, *President of the Communications Workers of America (CIO)*, before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, March 5, 1954.

# To the International Union of the Catholic Press

MSGR. GIOVANNI B. MONTINI

*Letter addressed to Count Giuseppe Dalla Torre, President of the  
International Union, May, 1954.*

THE International Union of the Catholic Press, which is preparing to hold its 4th Congress in Paris, serves too important a cause in contemporary Catholic life for the Sovereign Pontiff not to seize willingly upon the occasion offered Him to send anew to all the members of the Union His encouragement and instructions.

The exceedingly wise counsel which His Holiness gave three years ago to Union members meeting in Rome is, without doubt, still in everyone's memory and will usefully enlighten the present discussions. This year the Holy Father, drawing his inspiration from the theme of your Congress, would like, through me, to tell you in a most fatherly manner what the Church expects today of the Catholic press throughout the world.

Because of the high mission that falls to it, the Catholic press must first of all be an instrument of quality, a technically sound press, in the service of the Church. In our day, in fact, the professional demands made on the director of a newspaper or a news agency, and on the journalist himself, have become both more rigorous and pressing. And one cannot but admire in this respect the desire shown by delegates to this Congress to apply themselves closely to the conditions that govern the exercise of their profession, to pool their experiences, to compare their methods and to stimulate research.

The peculiar quality of journalism, that which particularly distinguishes it from other means of acting on public opinion, is the fact that it is tied to the events of the day and addressed to a reader whose main desire is for information. It is therefore by means of daily news—its verification, its presentation and commentaries upon it—that the publicist must most often carry on the work of truth and forward the education of minds. But in order to be read, to exert influence, he must also be a master of the art of speaking to public opinion in a language which it understands. One does not become a journalist without the necessary preparation. In the violent battle of the press the most ardent zeal cannot today supplant this indispensable know-how, and it would be impossible to draw the attention of those responsible for the Catholic press too closely to the effort imposed on them in this regard.

It is, moreover, up to the International Union over which you preside and to the three professional organizations belonging to it to take by suitable



means the steps necessary to strengthen and further increase the technical excellence of the Catholic press. But it is already time to thank the Permanent Secretariat of the Union for the great work it has done at the professional level since its foundation.

If the Church first asks the Catholic press for evidence of its true value, it is because of the irreplaceable service she expects from those of her sons whose mission it is to serve and enlighten public opinion.

The world is, in fact, engaged in a spiritual combat about whose stakes no one is ignorant. An immense wave of atheism is breaking over the world and rarely has action against the religion of Christ been carried on more shrewdly and more systematically. Even in the ranks of the faithful one meets Catholics whose confidence in the mission of the Church is shaken. One sometimes even hears bitter criticism from them directed against the Church which, because of their own failings, they willingly hold responsible for the progress of her enemies, whereas these latter are held to be worthy of every indulgence. In the presence of such a disturbance of public opinion, faced with the impatience of some and the discouragement of others, what is today the first duty of the Catholic journalist? Above all he will be a son of the Church, eager to serve his Mother; he will have above all an understanding of, and love for, the Church.

### TASK OF CATHOLIC JOURNALISTS

Commenting one day to some Roman priests on the "*credo sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*" of our profession of faith, the Holy Father said:

Show the Church, dear sons, the Mother of souls, visible on the mountain, the light of peoples; visible in her life, in her history, in her struggles and her triumphs, in her worship, her sacraments, her ministers, her hierarchy; visible in this Rome where the Vicar of Christ is the center of her unity and the source of her authority. . . . Make so holy a Mother loved and venerated.

And His Holiness added this always appropriate exhortation:

Awaken and revive among the faithful, especially among the young, that spiritual force that is so necessary today but which, too often, is lacking: the sense of Catholic honor. This is the praise and admiration of the son for this Mother. It is the "*sentire cum Ecclesia*." It is the awareness that, for the faithful, religion, Christ and the Church are all one (Discourse of Feb. 17, 1942. A.A.S. Vol. 34, p. 141).

These words of the Pontiff, do they not themselves trace the task of Catholic journalists? While certain people abandon themselves to doubt and criticism, the Catholic journalist worthy of the name will put his pen at the service of "Catholic truth, without diminishing it or hiding it on the pretext of not offending enemies of the faith" (Pius XI, *Rerum Omnium*. A. A. S. Vol. 15, p. 61). He will unmask error under whatever name it may hide. He will serve with courage the great causes of the Church according to her spirit and her instructions, especially in the fields of social justice and international peace. He will make it his duty to enlighten opinion on the merciless battle waged in certain countries against the Bride of Christ, which, because of this, will appear still greater in the eyes of the

faithful and, through the martyrdom of her bishops, priests and so many of her sons, in the eyes of all men of good-will.

### A LIVELY FAITH

This is a magnificent task in these troubled times when Catholics need perhaps to be strengthened in their zeal for the Church and at least enlightened on the true meaning of her decisions and of her actions amidst so many vicissitudes and obstacles.

As a man of character, the Catholic journalist will, according to the definition of the Holy Father, possess "profound love and unchangeable respect for the divine order, which animates and embraces all the domains of life; a love and respect which he must not be content to feel and nourish secretly in his own heart, but which he must cultivate in the hearts of his readers" (Discourse of Feb. 17, 1950. A. A. S. Vol. 42, p. 225). And this attitude of filial loyalty and confident docility the Church demands of him especially at a time when Christians must show through obedience the measure of their fidelity. It is then that the objectivity of his information, the firmness of his judgment and the humility of his own deference to religious authority can be for many a beneficial example and an indispensable support amidst the eddies of a bewildered public opinion. It is a veritable apostolate of the pen, for which we have been left the example of "so many truly great men, the honor and glory of journalism and of the Catholic press of modern times" (Ibid., p. 257).

In recommending professional virtues to them, the Holy Father would finally like to remind Congress delegates that the achievement of this service to the Church must constantly be inspired by a lively faith. The attitude of the Catholic publicist toward the Church he serves cannot, in fact, be the same as that of a journalist toward a government whose acts he judges. Above the bishops and the Supreme Pastor it is Jesus Christ Himself Who governs His Church. And that is why "if she speaks and makes judgments on the problems of the day, it is with a clear conscience of anticipating, through the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the decree which from the end of time her Lord and Head, the Judge of the Universe, will confirm and sanction (Christmas Radio Message, 1951. A. A. S. Vol. 44, p. 7). Also, as a loving son and a man of faith conscious of his responsibilities, the Catholic journalist will carefully guard himself against attributing the decisions and teachings of the hierarchy to human motives, to a lack of information or to ignorance of the needs of our times. Happy, on the contrary, to give to the documents of the Magisterium the importance and place of honor they deserve, he will willingly consecrate his pen to propagating the teachings of the Church and supporting her instructions, sure that he thereby works for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his brothers.

Confident that delegates to the International Congress in Paris will usefully work to develop the value of the Catholic press in their various countries and to multiply mutual contacts, and equally confident that they will cheerfully put themselves, all of one heart, at the service of the Church,

their Mother, the Sovereign Pontiff invokes upon their work an abundance of graces and is happy to send them, as well as to yourself and the worthy Father Gabel, organizer of the Congress, the favor of His paternal Apostolic Benediction.



### *Red Threat in Italy*

The attraction of Communism for large numbers of Italians has long puzzled us Catholic Americans. We wonder how this system of organized and militant atheism can be so effective in a Catholic country.

Some illuminating observations on this question are offered in a series of articles in the *Tablet* (London). Among the reasons given for Communism's hold on many Italians are the following:

*The religious illiteracy of millions of the people.* "A basic fact to be remembered by those who disparage the religious practice of the Italians is that from 1877 to 1923 no religious instruction was given in the schools or universities."

*The poverty of the thickly-populated country,* aggravated by long-standing social injustices. The Communist vote is basically a protest against existing economic and social conditions.

*The inefficient distribution of the parish clergy.* Italy has relatively fewer priests than the U. S. (one for every 820 Catholics, whereas the U. S. has one for every 627). Some parishes manned by a handful of priests have as many as 25,000 to 50,000 parishioners. Priests from the universities and church offices can provide part-time assistance, but they cannot build up the necessary community spirit in the parishes.

Despite these and other handicaps, the Italians' attachment to their religious beliefs is considerably stronger than a visitor might conclude.

Consider, for example, their intense love of family life, which speaks more profoundly of their Christian stamina than statistics do. Then there is the long list of contemporary Italians who have been beatified or canonized and who bear convincing witness to the depths of the faith of their country. There is the unquestioned devotion of Italians of all classes to the person of the Holy Father. There is the fact that the Communists, in appealing for Italian votes, find it necessary to disguise their real purpose, even to the extent of using religious emblems in their election literature to win the votes of simple folk. The Communists themselves in most cases never completely renounce the Church. It is rare that a dying Italian Communist will refuse the Last Sacraments.

Communism is a serious menace in the Italian peninsula and it would be rash and dangerous to predict its early demise. At the same time there is reason to hope that, through the Providence who writes straight with crooked lines, the present dangers will stimulate the Italians to correct the social injustices and religious laxity that have helped make Italian Communism possible.—CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER, *Cincinnati, Ohio, April 2, 1954.*



# Louisiana "Right-to-Work" Bill

*I. Statement of the New Orleans Archdiocesan Unit of the  
Catholic Committee of the South, May 27, 1954.*

**T**HE current session of the Louisiana State Legislature is faced with many important problems. But none is more important, ~~none more~~ controversial than the proposed statute known as the "Right-to-Work" bill. If this bill were concerned merely with technical matters, it would not be proper for such an organization as the Catholic Committee of the South to enter the controversy. But grave moral issues are involved. Hence we feel justified in discussing the ethical aspects of this subject.

## WHAT THE ADVOCATES SAY

The principal contention of those advocating the passage of the "Right-to-Work" bill is that no worker should be required to be a member of the organized labor movement in order to obtain or to retain employment. This requirement, so they argue, is an unnecessary and dangerous restriction of a freedom fundamental to American citizenship. They assert that they are not opposed to unions as such, but that the "closed-shop" and the "union-shop" provisions in a labor contract conflict with the individual freedom of a worker to exercise his right to work where and how he pleases. Therefore, the argument continues, in order to protect a worker against infringement upon his free access to a job, compulsory unionism should be prohibited by law.

The foregoing paragraph gives us, we believe, a fair summary of the position of the advocates of the "Right-to-Work" bill. On first glance this position seems unassailable. But upon deeper examination certain serious weaknesses appear.

## THE TRUE MEANING OF FREEDOM

In the first place, there is no such thing as unlimited freedom. Freedom to be genuine must be exercised within reasonable limits. These limits are determined by the Natural Moral Law, which has the exact same validity in economic relations as in every other phase of human activity.

Thus in the exercise of freedom of contract by which an employer and a worker agree on wages, hours of work and working conditions, the terms of the contract must be in accord with the demands of morality. And there is always underlying such agreements an element of natural justice, and one greater and more ancient than the free consent of contracting parties, namely, that the wage and other conditions of work be such as to conform with the intrinsic dignity of the human personality, which is as sacred in one person as in another. If, compelled by necessity or moved by fear of

■ worse evil, ■ worker accepts a harder condition, which although against his will he must accept because the employer imposes it, he certainly submits to force against which justice cries out in protest. Freedom of contract, then, is not absolute. It is conditioned by, among other things, the moral necessity of fulfilling the demands of justice and charity. And so, too, with the "right to work."

### THE NECESSITY FOR LABOR UNIONS . . .

The associations of workers called trade unions are dedicated to safeguarding and advancing the common interests of their members. Such organizations would seem to have an altogether indispensable role to play in the proper ordering and integrating of human labor in modern economic life. An individual's right to work, then, may not be exercised in disregard of the needs of the common good of these workers' organizations. Unions as well as the entire work-community possess rights capable of affecting and limiting legitimately the exercise of the right to work. Only within this framework can one judge reasonably of the issue of compulsory unionism and union security clauses.

### . . . AND FOR UNION SECURITY

If unions are to perform effectively their highly important function, the requirements of their common good must be recognized. In existing circumstances, therefore, may not "closed-shop" and "union-shop" provisions be among these requirements? The Archdiocesan unit of the Catholic Committee of the South would say "yes" to that question. Consequently, we hold that it would be unwise to prohibit these provisions as a matter of public policy.

### RAW MATERIAL OF CLASS WARFARE

Another consideration has caught our serious attention. It is a fact that already the proposed "Right-to-Work" bill has become a symbol of bitter struggle between organized management and organized labor in our State, which up to now has enjoyed an enviable degree of industrial peace. Thus this bill is setting class against class. It should be plain for all to see that the desperately-sought-for unity of human society cannot be founded on an opposition of classes; no more than can the right ordering of economic life be left to an unrestricted competition of forces. The whole free world longs for peace with justice and charity, and here in Louisiana we are preparing the conditions which can easily lead to economic warfare and intense bitterness among ourselves. In this way we are playing right into the hands of the Communists, whose principal weapon is hatred.

### ON THE OTHER HAND

None of the foregoing observations are to be understood ■ though we were unaware of certain faults in the organized labor movement. We certainly do not condone the abuses of irresponsible union officials which give

deceptive plausibility to such inept measures of correction as "Right-to-Work" bills. We condemn these abuses and these officials just as severely as we condemn their counterparts among employers. But the whole labor movement is not to be penalized for the sins of the relatively few.

### A FINAL APPEAL

In conclusion, we address ourselves to the parties principally concerned in this controversy.

To management that it may recognize in its support of this piece of legislation, aside from the moral issues to which we have alluded, a serious disregard of the danger of industrial strife which may ensue. Moreover, let them consider the divisive influence that would be set up now when unity and teamwork are the by-words of every person from the President of the United States to the most recently returned veterans of the fight against Communist aggression.

To labor that it may exercise mature judgment and self-discipline in rooting out the internal conditions in some unions which invite agitation for such punitive measures as "Right-to-Work" bills.

To legislators that they may weigh carefully the serious action they are about to take and that they come to realize that a catch-phrase like "right to work" for the individual may well be an "invitation to disaster" for the general welfare. All of which imposes the gravest responsibility upon them, especially when we are faced with forces from within and from without that breed and thrive upon the type of discontent and insecurity which this legislation would probably foster.

*II. Telegram dated June 1, 1954 to the chairman and members of the Senate Industrial Relations Committee, State Capitol, Baton Rouge, concerning the "Right-to-Work" bill introduced in the State Legislature.*

**P**LEASE weigh carefully that the text of the "Right-to-Work" bill is too involved and lacks clearness and simplicity of expression. It is a misnomer because it actually denies what it pretends to give, namely, the right to work. It is reactionary because it nullifies all that has been accomplished in our State through the organized labor movement for the mutual benefit of working classes and the stability of industry.

It is insincere because, while it pretends to guarantee the right to work, it actually frustrates that right, in effect exposing labor to lose security, a decent standard of living and humane working conditions. It makes a mockery of the constitutional right to organize for the common good and welfare. It invites continuing and recurring social strife and discontent. In a word, it is unfair and unsocial class legislation contrary to the common good.

Labor no less than management needs reform, but neither should be virtually outlawed. In our estimation the "Right-to-Work" bill does not deserve the approval of your honorable committee, and I speak in the in-



terest of social justice, equity and public welfare. Rev. Louis J. Twomey of Loyola University will represent me at the final session of your committee's public hearings.

Respectfully,  
JOSEPH FRANCIS RUMMEL,  
Archbishop of New Orleans

*III. Remarks of the Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S.J., Director of Institute of Industrial Relations and Regent of the School of Law, Loyola University, New Orleans, before the Industrial Relations Committee of the Louisiana State Senate, June 2, 1954*

**H**ONORABLE Chairman and distinguished members of the Industrial Relations Committee of the Louisiana State Senate:

I deeply appreciate the privilege of returning to this rostrum after a lapse of only five days.<sup>1</sup> Permit me again to identify myself. I am Father Louis J. Twomey, S.J., Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations and Regent of the School of Law, Loyola University. And for the second time I have the honor to come before your Committee specially commissioned to represent His Excellency, Joseph Francis Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans.

My specific purpose today is to reply to an advertisement which appeared on page 24 of the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* for Sunday, May 30, 1954. This ad was sponsored by an unidentified group which calls itself the Catholic Laymen's Committee for the "Right to Work." Two false impressions have been created by that ad: 1) The Catholic authorities of the Archdiocese of New Orleans are not correctly interpreting the social doctrine of the Church especially as regards the proposed "Right-to-Work" bill; and 2) the Catholic Church is unfavorable to the cause of organized labor. On both counts nothing could be further from the truth. Since the ad is directly intended to influence the action of this committee, I beg your indulgence for the purpose of setting the record straight.

In order to put our discussion in its proper perspective, it will be helpful to review briefly the historical position of the Catholic Church regarding labor unions. Let us go back a little over sixty-three years. On May 15, 1891, Pope Leo XIII described the economic and social conditions of that time in these words:

... the whole process of production as well as trade in every kind of goods has been brought almost entirely under the power of a few, so that a very few rich and exceedingly rich men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of non-owning workers (*Rerum Novarum*, #6, N.C.W.C. Ed.).

He added that immediate and effective measures had to be taken to rescue the workers from such shameful conditions. One of the principal remedies insisted on by Leo was the formation of what he called workers' associations. In his words: "... employers and workers themselves can

<sup>1</sup> On Father Twomey's first appearance, he spoke extemporaneously.

accomplish much in this matter. . . . but associations of workers occupy first place . . ." (op. cit., #68-69). These associations, the Pope says, are highly opportune, and based on a natural right; it is truly to be desired that these workers' associations grow in number and become vigorously active (op. cit., #69).

### RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

Forty years later, on May 15, 1931, Pope Pius XI reiterated in even stronger words the necessity for organization among workers. In the following chiseled language, he had this to say:

At that time (1891) in many nations those at the helm of state, plainly imbued with liberalism, were showing little favor to workers' associations . . .; nay, rather they openly opposed them, and while going out of their way to recognize similar organizations of other classes and show favor to them, they were with criminal injustice denying the natural right to form associations to those who needed it most to defend themselves from ill treatment at the hands of the powerful. There were even some Catholics who looked askance at the efforts of workers to form associations of this type as if they smacked of a Socialistic or revolutionary spirit (*Quadragesimo Anno*, #30).

It may not be out of order to suggest that the American Sugar Cane League examine its collective conscience to determine its guilt relative to the "criminal injustice" referred to in the foregoing passage. You will recall that the League met with unenviable success last October in beating down the efforts of the little people of our cane fields to exercise their God-given, constitutionally-guaranteed right to join a union.

On March 19, 1937, this same Pope Pius XI used stinging phrases to rebuke those Catholics who "refused to understand that Christian charity demands the recognition of certain rights due to the workingman, which the Church has explicitly acknowledged." "What is to be thought," continues the Pope, "of the action of those Catholics who in one place succeeded in preventing the reading of our encyclical, *On Reconstructing the Social Order* (to which we have previously referred) in their local churches? Or of those Catholic industrialists who even to this day have shown themselves hostile to a labor movement that We Ourselves recommended? Is it not deplorable that the right of private property, defended by the Church, should so often have been used as a weapon to defraud the workingman of his just salary and his social rights?" (*Divini Redemptoris*, #50). We are inclined to believe that the members of the Catholic Laymen's Committee for "the right to work" have subjected themselves to this same indictment.

In our own country, the Catholic Bishops have on numerous occasions spoken on economic and social problems in a manner unmistakably to the point. Let us single out one of their statements which is specially pertinent, that of February 7, 1940:

There are two attitudes which represent extreme positions respecting our economic and social order. The one attitude is espoused by those who reject any and every kind of economic planning or organization. They constitute the group of extreme individualists or the so-called school of economic liberalism. They want

no interference whatsoever with the individual either from the government or from the social pressure of group organizations. They will tolerate no restrictions upon individual initiative or personal enterprise. They are liberal only to the extent that they wish to be liberated from all social responsibility. They call it free enterprise but the freedom is for those who possess great resources and dominating strength rather than for the weak or those who depend simply on their own labor for their well-being.

They oppose all efforts to establish collective bargaining by organized labor and they resent the action of government in enacting laws which make such collective bargaining obligatory. If there is to be any social planning, they will do it themselves without the collaboration of labor, consumers or the government. They want the government to be restricted to the function of a policeman or umpire in enforcing private contracts but not to be entrusted with the responsibility of promoting justice and the common good.

Again we permit ourselves to speculate as to whether the members of the Catholic Laymen's Committee fit the pattern of the rugged individualists just described.

We continue from the 1940 Statement of the American Bishops:

The second group reject totally this attitude of the individualists and rush to the opposite extreme. These latter desire to socialize all resources or establish a state collectivity. Either all property, as in pure Communism, or at least all productive property, as in Socialism, should be owned in their theory by the community or by the state. The state or the community thereupon will engage through its bureaus and agencies in developing an elaborate system of national economic planning. The hope, impractical as that method may be, is to make provision for the needs of all citizens so that there will be no surplus and no deficiency. This system would ignore human nature and human rights as flagrantly as the aforementioned group of individualists. In fact, experience indicates that where this system has been tried human beings are victimized in a manner and to an extent even more disastrous. Persecution is the logical and inevitable result of such economic dictatorship . . . (*The Church and Social Order*, #50, 51 & 52).

It was these facts thus outlined by the American Bishops that prompted Pope Pius XI to refer to economic individualism on the one hand and economic collectivism on the other as "twin rocks of shipwreck" (*Quadragesimo Anno*, #46).

As our historical survey of the Catholic position relative to organized labor widens, we find rich material in the justly-famous joint pastoral letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province of Quebec in Canada. It was issued on February 14, 1950, and is entitled *The Problem of the Worker in the Light of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. This letter has been formally approved by the present Pope through an official agency of the Vatican, and thus becomes of universal value as far as Catholics are concerned. Incidentally, I may observe that many of our Louisiana citizens trace their ancestry back to the Province of Quebec, whence this letter had its origin. I now cite from that letter: "To fulfill the role which is theirs in the national economy, to promote their professional interests, to realize their legitimate economic and social claims, the workers ought to unite in solid professional organizations [that is, in labor unions] . . ." (op. cit., #99).

And from the same document comes the vindication not only of the workers' right to join unions but of the obligation to do so:



Present circumstances render still more pressing and imperious the obligation of the workers . . . to exercise that right . . . (#100).

Every man has the duty to see that all his professional interests are protected and secure. He has the duty to aim at obtaining for himself and his family all that is necessary to lead a truly human life, sheltered against the chances of the future. He has the duty to cooperate for the welfare of his fellow citizens, especially those to whom he is united by common interests. He has the duty to collaborate for the restoration of a more balanced social order by favoring the respect of justice in all the activities of labor, industry and commerce. The isolated worker cannot achieve this. United with his fellow workers, he will be able to perform that imperious social duty. In the present state of things, therefore, there is a moral obligation to take an active part in the professional organization (that is, the labor union) (#101).

### ENCOURAGED BY CHURCH

And from the present Pope, Pius XII, comes this endorsement: "Unions have arisen as a spontaneous and necessary consequence of capitalism embodied in an economic system. As such, the Church gives her approval to them, always with the condition that . . . they endeavor to promote a Christian order in the world of the workers" (*Allocution to Belgian Workers*, September 11, 1949; cf. Cronin *Catholic Social Principles*, p. 405).

And again from the same Pope Pius XII: "To obtain the desired concord between labor and capital, recourse is had to the professional organization and the labor union, understood not as weapons destined exclusively for a defensive or offensive war which would provoke reactions and reprisals, not as a flowing river which submerges and separates, but rather as a bridge which unites these groups" (*Discourse to Members of the Italian Electrical Industry*, January 25, 1946; cf. Cronin, op. cit., p. 413).

Even such a limited insight into history should be convincing proof that the Catholic Church has not only consistently defended the right of workers to join unions, but more, it has encouraged and continues to encourage them to become active union members. Only within the context, then, of this historical social teaching can the ad of the aforementioned Catholic Laymen's Committee be judged for what it is: an unconscious, we hope, but nonetheless a subtle and dangerous distortion of the Catholic Church's position regarding labor unions.

In that ad it is made to appear that the social teaching of Pius XII favors the economic philosophy of the "right-to-work" bill now under the scrutiny of the Senate Committee on Industrial Relations. Pius XII did say, as the ad reports, but in a much wider context, that

Consciences are today also afflicted by other oppressions . . . again, access to employment or to places of labor is made to depend upon registration in certain parties or in certain organizations which trace their origin to the labor market. . . . How, therefore, can they consider it normal that the protection of the personal rights of the worker be more and more in the hands of an anonymous group, working through the agency of immense organizations which are of their very nature monopolies? The worker thus wronged in the exercise of his personal rights will surely find especially painful the oppression of his liberty and of his conscience, caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine (*Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII*, December 24, 1952).

Thus far the citation from Pius XII.

The first comment I should like to make is that whatever may be the meaning of that passage, it certainly cannot be so construed as to imply any denial of the approval of labor organizations often voiced in emphatic terms by Pius XII himself as well as by his predecessors. Neither can it be understood ■■ though Pius XII were in favor of depriving unions of the necessary means to operate effectively, namely, adequate and morally-acceptable security measures, among which, as we shall see, are the "closed shop" and the "union shop."

Papal documents are generally tightly written, and not always easy to understand even by qualified persons. To use the difficult statement in question, then, as an instrument for partisan purpose reveals the shallow judgment and poor taste, at least in this instance, of the Catholic Laymen's Committee.

### NO CONDEMNATION OF CLOSED SHOP

It is by no means clear that Pius XII was even referring to the "closed shop" ■■ practised in America and much less that he condemned such practice.

The Popes issue pronouncements, such as the one under review, with the world scene in mind, and these are to be interpreted according to the specific circumstances in each country. It was this consideration that prompted the Rev. John F. Cronin, Assistant Director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and one of the outstanding commentators on Catholic social principles and practices in the United States, to observe in regard to the statement of Pius XII: The Pope "wrote against the background of current problems. Thus he mentions party membership as a condition of employment. It is well known that only Communists can obtain the key jobs in Red-controlled countries. . . . Again the Pope mentions as a 'burden of conscience' control by unions of 'access to employment.' Clearly this would be true in parts of modern Europe. In some countries unions are heavily affected by ideology and politics. It would be ■ moral problem were a man forced to join ■ Marxist union in order to secure work. Conditions in America are different," continues Father Cronin. "A good Christian can belong to most American unions without this involving any moral compromise. . . . it is the rare union convention which does not have a Catholic bishop, often ■ cardinal, to give ■ invocation" (cf. *The Catholic Standard*, January 9, 1953, p. 6, Washington, D. C.).

And in the same vein the authoritative Catholic weekly, *America*, speaks of Pius XII's statement: "If the reader keeps in mind that the Pope is intent on defending the rights of workers to obtain jobs without violating their consciences, it will be clear at once that he is not referring to American workers or American trade unions. So far as rights of conscience go, American workers have been and are especially fortunate. Unlike some West European workers, they do not have to be Socialists to work or to belong to a trade union. . . . unlike Russian workers and workers in all

Communist-dominated countries, they are not obliged to belong to the Communist Party, or to some so-called labor union which . . . exists only to regiment and discipline them in the name of a godless state." (*America*, January 24, 1953, p. 445).

For additional evidence that the principle of the closed shop has never been condemned by ecclesiastical authorities in the United States we refer again to Father Cronin: ". . . American Catholic social writers have generally endorsed the 'closed shop' as a morally-acceptable practice. . . ." (therefore), he concludes "it does not seem reasonable to assume that Pius XII in attacking current evils would have in mind a custom which American theologians have found morally acceptable" (loc. cit).

Finally, in further confirmation of the Catholic position on compulsory unionism, we cite again from the Quebec Bishops:

In order to realize all these aims, and obtain efficacious joint action, the unions must be able to rely on the greatest possible number of members, without ever facing recruiting difficulties and open or hidden opposition to their action. Hence one perceives how necessary it is that union security be understood according to the exigencies of true freedom of association. Employers and legislation must favor this security. It is up to the employers and employes to determine, according to given circumstances, through a collective agreement, the formula by which security will be assured in every case (#112).

In the light of the eminent authorities on the economic and social teachings of the Catholic Church from whom we have cited, it seems scarcely short of brazen presumption for the Catholic Laymen's Committee publicly to repudiate this overwhelming mass of evidence and set themselves up anonymously as trustworthy interpreters of, admittedly, a difficult passage from a statement of Pius XII. And to compound this impropriety they attempt to insinuate that "The Living Pope Pius XII" is in favor of a proposed piece of Louisiana legislation which the Archbishop of New Orleans has roundly condemned.

To say these things, Gentlemen, is extremely distasteful, I can assure you. But such things need to be said in order, as I have indicated, to keep the record straight. Neither Archbishop Rummel nor I entertain any personal resentment toward whoever may constitute the Catholic Laymen's Committee. But we do deeply regret that they have seen fit to inject the revered personality of Pius XII into this controversy through an interpretation of their own making.

Does anything we have said or implied lead us to deny that there are certain unworthy and unscrupulous men in the labor movement? Certainly not! We know there are such men and we stigmatize them for what they are: base betrayers of a sacred trust, pitiful besmirchers of the good name of organized labor and of the honest, God-fearing men who constitute the overwhelming majority of union members. But we do not seek to cripple through legislation or otherwise the corporate form of doing business because of the proportionate number of crooks we uncover in corporations, banks and in other areas of commercial and professional life. By the same token, neither should we be trapped by the glib and distorted propaganda



of those who would damn the entire organized labor movement because of the crimes of the miserable few.

Gentlemen of the Senate Industrial Relations Committee, we are assembled here today in an atmosphere as tense as any history has ever known. The fearful probability of our world being plunged into its most devastating war is a present reality. Dread expectancy grips our souls. Bewilderment, confusion, frustration, overwhelm us. The crisis of crises is upon us.

Do not, I beg you, intensify this crisis by adding the "right-to-work" bill to the already towering burden of economic and social maladjustments which even now threaten the stability and even the survival of all we have known and loved.

And in conclusion. There comes a time in the life of every man when the call to greatness is the order of the day. That time for each member of this committee, I sincerely believe, is *now*. Yes, now is the time to rise above the din and roar of class-conscious argumentation. Now is the time to take on the moral grandeur of men who will have no part with special interests at the expense of the general welfare. Now is the time to assume the role of genuine statesmen and make yourselves superior to the pull of personal interests and to the lure of political expediency. This is the price you must pay now for greatness in the eyes of God as well as in the eyes of your fellow men. If you are willing to pay this price, you will kill the "Right-to-Work" bill in your Committee.

In the name of the Archbishop of New Orleans and in my own name, I thank you.

*IV. Telegram sent to the Members of the Capital and Labor Committee of the Louisiana House of Representatives, June 22, 1954*

**W**ORTHY of your consideration is that the "Right-to-Work" bill is reactionary legislation that will violate the principles of social justice, breed discontent, continue strife between workers and employers, invite misery and condemn the underprivileged to stagnation economically and socially. Let not our State bar the gateways to civic unity, industrial progress, social peace and economic prosperity for all. This would result from enforcing the "Right-to-Work" bill. The Rev. Louis Twomey of Loyola University will represent me at your hearings.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH FRANCIS RUMMEL

Archbishop of New Orleans

*V. Remarks of Father Twomey before the Capital and Labor Committee of the Louisiana House of Representatives, June 23, 1954*

**O**N TWO occasions in the recent past, I have had the distinction of acting as spokesman for Archbishop Rummel in voicing opposition from the Catholic viewpoint to the proposed "Right-to-Work" bill. On both these

occasions it was my honor to address the Industrial Relations Committee of the State Senate. I do not now propose to repeat the arguments I submitted to that Committee. These arguments are readily available to any who wish to study them.

But what I do propose to do is to meet squarely a challenge that has been flung at Archbishop Rummel and myself. That challenge comes not alone from some of our non-Catholic brethren, but from certain prominent and influential Catholics in the employer class. In effect the challenge adds up to this: Archbishop Rummel and Father Twomey, by implicating themselves in the "Right-to-Work" controversy, have 1) "expressed merely their own opinions," 2) "mixed religion and politics," and 3) "threatened the sacred American tradition of Separation of Church and State."

The nature of this challenge is such that it demands an answer, and because this challenge bears directly on the action being considered by the Committee, this is, I believe, the appropriate forum for delivering that answer.

At the outset let it be clearly understood that neither Archbishop Rummel nor I have the slightest personal advantage to gain or lose from the passage or the defeat of this proposed statute. In designating me to appear twice before the Senate Committee and now before this Committee, the Archbishop was and is acting as an authoritative interpreter of moral principles in the specific circumstances of this proposed "Right-to-Work" bill. In so doing he is not using his own imagination to spin out social and economic theory. He is applying to a practical problem the logical deductions from a time-honored body of moral teaching relative to economic and social life. This body of teaching can be found principally in what are known as the social encyclicals of the Popes.

### BILL IS MORALLY UNACCEPTABLE

The Archbishop has condemned the "Right-to-Work" bill not because of some personal bias or self-centered whim, but because the substantive content of this bill is seriously at variance with the very principles established in the aforementioned social doctrine of the Catholic Church. The cogency and validity of this doctrine have appealed to and won the enthusiastic approval of thousands inside and outside the Catholic Church. And in the particular instance of the "Right-to-Work" bill thousands of non-Catholics have acclaimed Archbishop Rummel in his exposure of this bill as morally unacceptable. Nonetheless, it is certainly understandable that many other non-Catholics, who do not acknowledge Archbishop Rummel as their spiritual leader, would see in his statements only an expression of his "personal opinion." We feel, however, that if these critics more fully understood the solid reasoning and the integrity of motive upon which his position is based, they would come to praise and not to blame the Archbishop of New Orleans for his forthright stand in this matter.

But we are faced with a widely different situation when Catholics attack the Archbishop and assume the same critical attitude as their non-Catholic colleagues. These Catholics should know that the Archbishop does not

lightly enter a controversy as fraught with conflicting interests ■ is the proposed "Right-to-Work" bill, and that serious moral issues alone justify such entrance. Further, they should at least be willing to grant that the Archbishop is far better qualified than they to measure the pertinence of moral principles to a specific piece of legislation. And it is solely because of the moral issues involved that the Archbishop has concerned himself with the "Right-to-Work" bill. Any insinuation to the contrary is a calumny.

That grave moral issues are involved is evident from the nature of the question itself, as well as from the fact that both parties to this great debate have appealed to the moral righteousness of their respective sides. As ■ result dangerous confusion and even, I say it sadly, bitter antagonism have been created. If ever moral guidance were needed, it is in just such ■ situation. And to whom should conscientious men, Catholic and non-Catholic, turn in such a need if not to their religious leaders? And if a religious leader would refuse, for fear of criticism, of financial reprisal, or for whatever other reason to take the risks always inherent in any type of meaningful leadership, that leader would be guilty of a serious dereliction of duty. It was for this reason that once Archbishop Rummel reached the conclusion that serious moral issues were involved (these we have developed in our previous addresses) in this proposed "Right-to-Work" bill, he had the courage to brave whatever risks might be lurking in his saying so in unmistakable language. But one of the risks he had no valid reason for anticipating was the rejection of his moral judgment by a significant number of those who call him "The Shepherd of their souls."

This is not to say that Catholics lack the freedom to make up their own minds on public issues. Catholics are as free as are other citizens to do this. But when these issues are vested with serious moral implications, it comes with ill-grace and misguided independence that Catholics equate their own conclusions with those of their recognized spiritual leader. And therein stalks ■ danger not only to Catholics but to their fellow Americans as well. For if the moral judgment of duly-constituted authority in moral matters is to be considered of no greater value than "personal opinion," then the foundation not only of authority in religion, but of all other areas of authority would be undermined. And ultimately the only method of preserving order in society would be physical force. This is precisely the theory of totalitarian regimes, of which we want no part.

At this point, let me face ■ charge sometimes leveled at Catholics. We have been accused of being "puppets on a string," that is, as the fantasy has it, "we dance to the tune as selected and played by the hierarchy." That accusation is false, as every well-informed non-Catholic should know, and as every Catholic knows. This does not mean, however, that in the pursuit of material well-being, ■ Catholic, or for that matter any other religious-minded man or woman, can refuse to be guided by the moral counseling of his own religious leaders. Not to accept this guidance is to expose himself to shipwreck on the only worthwhile journey ■ man or woman will ever take, namely, the journey to eternity.

The position, then, of the Church is that ■ refusal on the part of Catho-



lics to follow her moral directives as interpreted by legitimate authority is to invite disaster in the one enterprise which, above all others, is of transcendent importance. When, therefore, an Archbishop in a given locality makes a moral judgment on such a measure as the "Right-to-Work" bill, he is not "merely expressing his personal opinion," but is guiding in ways which are best for their temporal and eternal welfare those who acknowledge his authority.

If and when Catholics, or for that matter Methodists, Baptists, Jews and the members of other denominations cut themselves off from the moral guidance of their respective spiritual leaders, a tragic era will have dawned, and the beginning of the end will have come for America.

### "MIXING RELIGION AND POLITICS"

The second phase of the challenge referred to above is akin to the first. It is that Archbishop Rummel and I are "mixing religion and politics" in projecting ourselves into this controversy. In one sense we plead "not guilty" to that charge, but in another we are happy to enter the plea of "guilty."

Let me first take up the plea of "not guilty." If by politics is meant partisan politics, in which Americans are perfectly free to choose according to their own sincere determination the particular political affiliation which suits them, then, in as far as we represent the Catholic Church, we take no sides. I personally am a Democrat. But frankly I don't know to what party Archbishop Rummel gives his adherence. He as a private citizen, I as a private citizen and other Catholics as private citizens can be and actually are of varied political loyalties. When membership in political parties, as in the United States, does no violence to one's conscience, Catholics, like other Americans, can belong to any party they wish, and they can and do differ even vigorously from their fellow Catholics on partisan issues. In this sense the political complexion of Catholics, including cardinals, archbishops, bishops, priests and laymen can and do vary as widely as the colors of a brightly-fashioned mosaic. Again, in this meaning of politics, a Catholic is on his own and need pay no heed to the political persuasion of a given ecclesiastical authority, whatever position he may occupy.

But there is another meaning to politics, namely, "politics is the science of good government." And in this sense no true American can be indifferent to politics. By the nature of our citizenship in a representative form of government, we are obligated to participate in this science of good government, and to contribute our proportionate share toward seeing to it that government fulfills its God-appointed objective, namely, the building-up of an environment in which the dignity, the supreme value and the sacredness of every individual and of every organized group of individuals will be acknowledged, respected and protected. In other words, every citizen is under the obligation to help his government more effectively promote the general welfare. Hence, politics, in the sense in which we are now dealing with it, can no more be separated from the guiding norms of the moral law than can any other aspect of human activity.

Thus if the "Right-to-Work" bill were simply another expression of partisan politics, Archbishop Rummel and I would indeed be "mixing religion with politics," and therefore would be entirely out of order. But this bill in its various restrictions would seriously and adversely affect the peace, the order and the tranquillity of the general welfare of our State. And if using our efforts to help stave off such ill effects is considered "mixing religion with politics," the Archbishop and I plead guilty.

Moreover, to accord to a person with religious authority, when he speaks out on the moral character of public problems, no greater competency than to a private individual, is severely to abridge his right as well as his duty to contribute to the general welfare precisely in his capacity as a leader. This is not so much a loss to the leader in question as it is to the community at large.

Let those who say that religion and politics do not mix, study carefully the words of the Father of our Country in his "Farewell Address":

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports . . . reason and experience both forbid ■ to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles.

### CHURCH AND STATE

And now let me get on to the third charge, namely, that Archbishop Rummel and I are "threatening the sacred American tradition of the separation of Church and State." Amazingly enough, that charge, in this instance, originated not from a non-Catholic, but from a Catholic source.

In the first place I should like to inquire just what our accusers mean by the separation of Church and State. If this phrase is intended to enunciate the principle of the First Amendment to the Constitution, that there shall be no state-established religion, then Archbishop Rummel and I whole-heartedly agree with that interpretation. And I might add that I know of no American cardinal, archbishop, bishop, priest or lay Catholic who would have it otherwise. The Catholic Church has prospered under the American system, and every Catholic worthy of the name will suffer, bleed and die, if necessary, for the preservation of this system.

But if our accusers mean that religion and government are to be so separated as to have no meaningful relationship one with the other, we refuse to go along. Such an interpretation dishonors the framers of the Constitution; it advocates a theory that would practically exclude God from the political, economic, educational and social thoughts and actions of men. But no man can disregard God and play a part in God's world. Unfortunately, however, there are many men—and their number is daily increasing—who in practice live their lives without recognizing that this is God's world. For the most part they do not deny God. Not all of them would agree that all moral values derive from merely human conventions. But they fail to bring ■■ awareness of their responsibility to God into their lives as individuals and as members of society. This is a brief description of what is known as secularism. And it was secularism that produced the fertile soil in which such monstrosities as Fascism, Nazism and Communism took root and



flourished. If secularism is not checked in the United States, the time may not be far distant when the political, economic and social practices of our country will not differ essentially from the godless pattern set in Communist-dominated lands.

The separation, then, of Church and State, in the sense that our Government is restricted by the Constitution from establishing any particular denomination as the state religion we fully endorse. But that religion, that is, belief in God and the supremacy of God and the things of God, should be excluded from the affairs of state we cannot and will not accept. Thus we are on the same secure ground with President Eisenhower when less than two weeks ago, on June 14, he made a law of the land the Act of Congress inserting the words "under God" in the traditional pledge of allegiance to the flag. On that occasion he said in part:

Over the globe, mankind has been cruelly torn by violence and brutality and, by the millions, deadened in the mind and soul by a materialistic philosophy of life. . . . In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future; in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace or in war.

I earnestly hope that nothing which has been said in this address will be understood as imputing malice to any person or persons who may be parties to the challenge to which our remarks have been devoted. Neither Archbishop Rummel nor I question the sincerity or the good faith of these persons. It is our firm conviction, however, that in their criticism of our conduct in this matter, they have acted hastily and unwisely. . . .

*VI. Message sent by Monsignor Plauche to all Members of the Louisiana House of Representatives, State Capitol, Baton Rouge, June 28, 1954*

**H**IS Excellency the Most Rev. Archbishop, has full and complete confidence in Father Louis J. Twomey, S. J., whose statements in regard to the "Right-to-Work" bill have been made at the request and in the name of His Excellency.

The Most Rev. Archbishop is entirely confident that the Papal encyclicals in their full text and context amply justify and even demand the stand he has taken against the "Right-to-Work" bill.

He is equally convinced that quotations from a series of Papal documents in a certain statement issued under date of June 27 in one of our leading metropolitan newspapers in the form of an advertisement have been wrenched from their original text and context and selected arbitrarily to suit the purpose of the authors of that particular advertisement.

We concede that labor as well as management requires investigation and correction. But the bill in question goes too far.

Therefore, both in his responsibility as Archbishop and in his capacity as a private citizen, solicitous for the moral, social and material welfare of



all his fellow citizens, His Excellency reiterates his stand against the "Right-to-Work" bill and asks for its defeat.

(RT. REV. MSCR.) CHARLES J. PLAUCHE,  
*Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New Orleans*



### ***Basis of Labor's Strength***

The American labor movement has built an organization which is strong because it has built on a foundation which recognizes that the rights which it defends are God-given rights. To this may be attributed the great contribution which it has made in correcting industrial and social evils in America. From this has come the inspiration, the courage and the devotion which have characterized its defense of the neglected, the underprivileged and those who are the object of discrimination.

The pattern which has been a safe guide in the past must continue as a guide in the future. Today from this necessary and fundamental principle of a man's divine dignity the American Labor Movement must draw the inspiration which will solve the problems which are ahead. Surely all of us must recognize that today in industrial America we are beginning a new development in our economy. The time is at hand when labor and management must take a hard look at their relationship and learn to give greater emphasis to their common interests rather than to their special interests. There must be established a relationship of cooperation, a relationship of partnership, a relationship in which both labor and management recognize that the welfare of the industry and the welfare of the public are their joint responsibility—*Most Rev. Henry J. O'Brien, Archbishop of Hartford, at the Peter McGuire Memorial Award Dinner, sponsored by the Connecticut A. F. L., Cheshire, Conn., June 21, 1954.*

### **THE CATHOLIC MIND**

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph F. MacFarlane

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Patrick H. Collins

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

# MARY and THE POPES



## FIVE GREAT MARIAN LETTERS

*Edited by* **THOMAS J. M. BURKE, S.J.**

*Translations by American Jesuit Theologians*

**108 pages \$1.00**

- **FULGENS CORONA**—*Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XII*—which proclaims the celebration of the Marian Year throughout the world, in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
- **INEFFABILIS DEUS**—*Bull of Pope Pius IX*—which defines the Immaculate Conception.
- **AD DIEM ILLUM LAETISSIMUM**—*Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius X*—which develops the theme of the Immaculate Conception that since the Eternal God in His providence saw fit to give us the God-man through Mary, there is nothing left to do but to receive Christ from her hands.
- **MUNIFICENTISSIMUS DEUS**—*Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius XII*—in which it is defined as a dogma of faith that Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory.
- **JUCUNDA SEMPER**—*Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII*—in which the saintly Pope discourses on the Rosary, its mysteries, their meaning, and Mary's power in her office to win grace for us.

**The America Press • 70 E. 45th St. • New York 17, N. Y.**





# TOTIS VIRIBUS

Since our founding in 1855, Will & Baumer has worked unceasingly to supply the Church with candles of the highest quality. Every resource at our command—untiring laboratory research, experienced craftsmanship—has been devoted to making a better product . . . suited in every respect to the high purpose for which it is intended.

Latest Will & Baumer improvement is the New Style Sanctolite, recently being introduced to the Clergy. A scientifically-designed 7-day Sanctuary Light that burns steadier—and longer—it conforms to the high standards of quality and value inherent in every Will & Baumer product.



Purveyors to the  
Vatican by  
Appointment

## *Will & Baumer*

### CANDLE CO., INC.

THE PIONEER CHURCH CANDLE MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA

SYRACUSE BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO  
LOS ANGELES MONTREAL